

Proving Innocence of Muhammad ibn Abdul-Wahhab

One in Need of Allah

The First Section: False Accusations and Lies Against Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab

Regarding the Issue of Takfir – With Refutations and Responses.

The writings and messages of Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab, as well as the letters and works of the Imams and scholars of his Da'wah (call), have thoroughly explained the issue of Takfir (declaring someone a disbeliever) and fighting, giving it the proper and comprehensive explanation it deserves.

Despite this clarity and detail, we find that the opponents of the Sheikh's Da'wah fabricate lies and false accusations, inventing slander and attaching false charges to it – may Allah destroy them; how they are deluded! They have no reliable transmission, nor do they possess a claim backed by evidence.

This Salafi Da'wah, from its outset, clarified the belief in Tawhid (the oneness of Allah), and its scholars established the belief in Tawhid with the strongest proofs and clearest evidence, composing many books and letters in explaining and affirming Tawhid.

The scholars of the Da'wah prioritized the affirmation of Tawhid because it is the first obligation upon the accountable person, as is well known. Whoever fully understands the reality of Tawhid will necessarily understand what contradicts it.

This is clarified by what Sheikh Abdul Latif Ibn Abdul Rahman Ibn Hassan wrote in **Minhaj at-Tasis** (The Foundation Method):

"Know that whoever fully grasps the reality of any matter as it is in reality and understands its essence with its specific characteristics will necessarily know what contradicts it and opposes it. Confusion only arises due to the obscuring of one reality or the ignorance of both essences. When that is absent and full comprehension of both is attained, there is no room for confusion, and one cannot be mistaken for the other. How many nations have perished due to incomplete knowledge and the failure to know the definitions and realities! How much error, doubt, and distress have been caused by this! For example, Islam and Shirk (polytheism) are opposites that neither combine nor cancel each other out. Ignorance of the two realities or one of them has led many people to fall into Shirk and the worship of righteous individuals due to a lack of understanding of the realities and their true nature. If this ignorance is compounded by established customs, then the affliction worsens and the calamity deepens..." (1).

The scholars of the Da'wah did not limit their efforts to merely affirming the belief in Tawhid. They went further, warning against Shirk, listing the nullifiers of Islam, and discussing

the types and categories of Shirk and disbelief, warning the Ummah and removing the confusion. They also closed off the avenues and means to Shirk – may Allah have mercy on them all.

A quick glance at their scholarly works and practical stances on these matters will provide a sufficient answer and a clear explanation of the issue of Takfir and fighting, though most people do not know.

We will now present the fabrications and lies that the opponents of Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab's Da'wah have raised concerning Takfir and fighting, as documented in their writings or quoted from them by others. Then we will present the refutation and response through the writings of some of the Imams of this Salafi Da'wah.

One of the earliest liars who took a prominent role in this falsehood was Ibn Afaliq. He falsely accused Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab of declaring Muslims to be disbelievers. In his response to Ibn Muammar, Ibn Afaliq claimed:

"This man has declared the Ummah to be disbelievers. By Allah, he has belied the messengers and judged them and their followers to be polytheists." (1)

Ibn Afaliq further says, addressing Uthman Ibn Muammar:

"You have made the Takfir (excommunication) of the prophetic family, cursing and reviling them, a fundamental principle of your religion." (2)

He continues his fabrications, trying to dissuade Ibn Muammar from supporting the Salafi Da'wah, describing Sheikh Ibn Abdul Wahhab as:

"He swore a sinful oath by Allah that the Jews and polytheists are in a better state than this Ummah." (3)

In a letter he titled **Sarcasm of the Blind Followers of the Claimant of Renewing the Religion**, Ibn Afaliq accused Sheikh Ibn Abdul Wahhab of misleading and cursing the Ummah, even the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ. He said:

"I reviewed the principles upon which your Madhhab (school of thought) is based, and I found that you have taken a dangerous path. You cursed the Imams, reviled the notable figures of the Ummah, demolished the foundations of the Muhammadan creed, insulted all the prophetic Imams, and reached the point where you decisively declared the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ and the four Imams (Abu Hanifa, Malik, Shafi'i, and Ahmad) to be misguided." (4)

Another opponent, Al-Qabbani, also echoed the Takfir fabrication. He claimed that Sheikh Ibn Abdul Wahhab:

"Declared this entire Ummah to be disbelievers and disbelieved anyone who did not affirm their deviation and disbelief." (5)

He mocks the Sheikh and his followers, picturing their state on the Day of Judgment, saying sarcastically:

"... And the prophets and messengers came, each with thousands from his Ummah, but the noble Prophet ﷺ came with only a few from the people of Uaynah, while the rest of his Ummah are all eternally in Hellfire with the disbelievers, despite their numerous acts of worship and various types of devotion." (6)

Ibn Suhaym, another staunch opponent, wrote letters to the scholars of other regions inciting them against Sheikh Ibn Abdul Wahhab and his Da'wah, and he perpetuated the false claim that:

"One of his (Ibn Abdul Wahhab's) worst statements is that people have not been on anything (true) for 600 years." (7)

Ibn Suhaym went further in his fabrications, claiming:

"And one of the gravest things he says is that whoever does not agree with him on everything he says, or testifies that what he says is true, is definitely a disbeliever. And whoever agrees

with him and follows his way and believes everything he says, is considered a monotheist, even if he is purely sinful or whatever else he may be." (8)

Muhammad Ibn Muhammad Al-Qadri addressed Imam Abdul Aziz Ibn Muhammad Ibn Saud after receiving his letter, and in his reply, he wrote this falsehood:

"If you had reflected upon it with the eye of insight, you would not have judged the Muhammadan Ummah with major Shirk without any proof. This is nothing but misery, loss, and deprivation." (1)

Al-Qadri continued after reading the letter of Imam Abdul Aziz Ibn Muhammad Ibn Saud, describing him as:

"He judged the general believers and practicing scholars of the Ummah of the Prophet ﷺ with major Shirk." (2)

Al-Haddad introduced new forms of the Takfir and fighting accusations. One of his fabrications was:

"If a man wanted to enter his religion, he would tell him to testify against himself that he was a disbeliever, to testify that his parents died as disbelievers, and to testify that such and such scholars are disbelievers. If he testified to that, he would accept him; otherwise, he would kill him." (3)

Al-Haddad further addressed Sheikh Ibn Abdul Wahhab with this lie, saying:

"O Najdi! You are not content with making the living among the Muslims into polytheists until you extend this to the dead Muslims of many years, saying they were misguided and misguiding, and you even identified prominent scholars as among the misguided!" (4)

Al-Haddad even called for the practice of Shirk through seeking help from the dead, simply out of opposition to the Najdi (Ibn Abdul Wahhab), saying:

"It is necessary in these times of religious deterioration, with the advent of this innovator who claims that seeking help from the dead is Shirk, for the scholar and leader to openly engage in seeking help from the dead so that others may follow..." (5)

Hassan Ibn Umar Al-Shatti, in an addendum he wrote at the end of **Risalat Ithbat al-Sifat** (A Treatise on Affirming the Attributes), repeated this falsehood, saying that Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab was characterized by:

"Declaring Muslims to be disbelievers, believing their blood and wealth to be lawful, and enslaving their children." (6)

In another addendum at the end of **Risala fi Mushajarat Ahl Makkah wa Ahl Najd** (A Treatise on the Dispute Between the People of Makkah and Najd), Al-Shatti claimed that the letter revolved around:

"Declaring Muslims to be disbelievers and making their blood and wealth lawful." (7)

The Rafidi (Shiite) Abdul Ra'uf fabricated another lie about Sheikh Ibn Abdul Wahhab, claiming that the Sheikh shed the blood of thousands of Muslims, saying:

"How can the situation of a man who killed thousands of Muslims, those who say 'There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah,' those who give charity, fast, and make pilgrimage to the Sacred House of Allah, be justified? He even killed women and children without them committing any aggression, claiming that he alone was upon Tawhid and that all the Muslims were apostates." (1)

Al-Luknawi reveals his falsehood when he fabricated lies against Sheikh Imam, accusing him of declaring Muslims to be unbelievers and of permitting the shedding of their blood.

Among his fabrications is the following text:

"(Know that his belief is that all Muslims, except those of his sect, are disbelievers and polytheists. He believes that their wealth and blood are lawful, and it is permissible to enslave them. He cites fabrications that God has not revealed any authority for as proof.)"

(2)

Uthman bin Mansur also accused Sheikh Imam of this slander, claiming:

"(God has tested the people of Najd, indeed the entire Arabian Peninsula, with someone who rose against them, declaring both the specific and general members of the Ummah to be disbelievers, fighting them all unless they agreed with him. This was because he found those who supported him in this endeavor...)" (3)

Uthman falsely described the Sheikh Imam, saying:

"(But this man made obedience to him a sixth pillar of the five pillars of Islam...)" (4)

The master of lies, Dahlan, speaks about the fabrication that the Sheikh declared Muslims to be disbelievers and fought them. Among his lies and fabrications – which we quote verbatim – he says:

"(They do not consider anyone to be a monotheist unless they follow what they say, so in their view, the monotheists are the smallest minority.)"

And his brother Sulayman once said to him: How many pillars of Islam are there, O Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab? He replied: Five. So Sulayman said: You have made them six; the sixth, in your view, is that whoever does not follow you is not a Muslim. This, according to you, is the sixth pillar of Islam." (5)

Among Dahlan's lies is his statement:

"(They would declare the Ummah to be disbelievers from the last six hundred years, and the first one to declare this was Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab, and they followed him in that. If someone entered his religion and had performed the Hajj of Islam before that, they would tell him to perform Hajj again because his first Hajj was done while he was a polytheist, so the Hajj was not valid.)" (6)

Dahlan further increases the ugliness of his lies and the enormity of his fabrications, saying:

"(He would say to them: I am calling you to the true religion, and everything under the seven heavens is absolutely polytheistic. Whoever kills a polytheist will enter Paradise, so they followed him, and their souls were reassured by this statement...)" (7)

As is his habit in his writings, Al-Zahawi fills the pages with lies and falsehoods, accusing Sheikh Imam of declaring Muslims to be disbelievers and fighting them. Al-Zahawi says:

"(Then he authored a book for Ibn Saud titled 'Removing Doubts About the Creator of the Earth and Heavens,' (1) in which he declared all Muslims to be disbelievers, and claimed that people had been disbelievers for the last six hundred years.)" (2)

Al-Zahawi lies once again, saying:

"(Among the falsehoods adopted by the deviant Wahhabi sect is their declaration of disbelief upon all Muslims who oppose them.)" (3)

Al-Zahawi lies a third time, saying:

"(If someone asked what the Wahhabi sect believes in and what their goal is, and we said in response to both questions that it is the declaration of disbelief upon all Muslims, this would be a brief yet sufficient definition of their creed.)" (4)

One of the liars from the Rafidah [a derogatory term for Shia Muslims] spread the fabrication that Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab declared Muslims to be disbelievers and made their blood lawful, saying in a deceptive manner:

"(God wanted them to be brothers among themselves and to support each other against the enemy. But Ibn Abd al-Wahhab violated this fundamental principle and reversed the situation, declaring Muslims to be disbelievers, causing them to fight one another. That period did not end until they were in the hands of the enemies, destroying the foundations of the religion...)" (5)

The innovator Ahmad Rida Khan also spreads this false accusation, claiming about the Sheikh:

"(He takes pleasure in declaring his ancestors and teachers to be disbelievers, and he does not stop there, but declares all Muslims, including the Imams and scholars, to be disbelievers.

Ibn Abd al-Wahhab announced after the emergence of his new religion that the Muslim Ummah had been stumbling in the darkness of shirk [polytheism] for six hundred years, and later the Wahhabis echoed the words of their leader.)" (6)

Then comes Muhammad bin Najeeb Souqiyah, who surpasses his peers in lies and fabrications, saying:

"(Their doctrine is to declare the dead as disbelievers and to accuse the living among the monotheists of polytheism. And if someone asks about attributing disbelief and polytheism to all monotheists by the Wahhabis, the answer is that this is explicitly mentioned in their letters and books...)" (7)

From the offspring of these opponents in our present time, we cite the words of three of them, who slandered Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab – may God have mercy on him – and his followers and supporters by accusing them of declaring Muslims disbelievers and making their blood lawful.

The Shia Muhammad Jawad Mughniyah repeated this fabrication, following in the footsteps of his predecessors – the Rafidah – in lying and slander, saying:

"(There is no doubt that they mean by 'monotheists' only the Wahhabis themselves, and by 'polytheists' all other Muslims without exception.)" (8)

Hussein bin Hilmi Ishiq also spread this fabrication, commenting on the book *Iman and Islam* by Khalid al-Baghdadi, while lying about the Wahhabis:

"(They do not consider anyone other than themselves to be Muslims, and they declare everyone else to be disbelievers, saying that their wealth and lives are lawful for the Wahhabis.)"
(9)

A third person, named Malik bin Dawood – one of the claimants of Sufism – in his book titled *Islamic Truths*, spread this fabrication, and among his lies was:

"(Some scholars refer to the Wahhabi movement as 'the bloody movement')." (1)

He claims that the Wahhabis:

"(are determined that whoever is not a Wahhabi is a polytheist, who must be abandoned, and it is forbidden to deal with them in matters of religion or the world.)" (2)

He lies about them, saying:

"(The goal they seek to achieve is to establish Sunnism for themselves alone, and to declare the entire group of Muslims outside of them as disbelievers.)" (3)

After presenting some of this nonsense and slander from these opponents, who accused the call of Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab – may God have mercy on him – of declaring Muslims disbelievers, we now turn to some responses from the scholars of this Salafi call to refute this accusation and clarify the truth as it is. It will become clear – without a doubt – how weak this accusation is, and its falsehood will be exposed, even if many have repeated it. Do not be impressed by the abundance of the wicked, for the scum will be swept away, while what benefits the people remains in the earth.

This false accusation reached Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab – may God have mercy on him – and he responded to it multiple times.

Since the false accusation that he declared Muslims disbelievers and made their blood lawful spread widely in most Muslim lands, like a fire in dry grass, the Sheikh – may God have mercy on him – made sure to emphasize his responses and to declare his innocence from what was attributed to him. He sent these responses to different regions.

On a local level in the Najd region, we see that the Sheikh sent a letter to the people of Riyadh and Manfuha, refuting this false accusation. He said, may God have mercy on him:

"(As for your claim that we declare Muslims to be disbelievers, and ask how we can do such a thing, we do not declare Muslims to be disbelievers. We only declare the polytheists to be disbelievers.)" (4)

He sent a letter to Muhammad bin Eid, one of the religious scholars of Tharmada, in which he said:

"(As for what the enemies have claimed about me – that I declare people disbelievers based on suspicion or association, or that I declare the ignorant who have not had the proof established against them as disbelievers – this is a great slander. They intend to turn people away from the religion of God and His Messenger.)" (1)

In his letter to the people of Qassim, he pointed out the fabrications of his stubborn opponent, Ibn Suhaim, and cleared himself of the accusation of declaring Muslims disbelievers and killing them. The Sheikh said:

"(God knows that the man [Ibn Suhaim] has fabricated things about me that I never said and that never even crossed my mind. Among his claims is that I said people have not been on the right path for six hundred years, that I declare those who seek intercession through the righteous as disbelievers, that I declare Al-Busiri to be a disbeliever, and that I declare those who swear by anything other than God to be disbelievers. My response to these accusations is: Glory be to You, this is a great slander.)" (2)

Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab confirmed the falsehood of this accusation and refuted it in his letter to Hamad al-Tuwaijri, saying:

"(And likewise, the enemy deceives people by claiming that Ibn Abd al-Wahhab says: whoever does not come under my authority is a disbeliever. We say: Glory be to You, this is a great slander. Rather, we bear witness before God that whoever acts upon monotheism and disavows shirk [polytheism] and its people is a Muslim in any time and place. We only declare those who associate others with God in His divinity as disbelievers after the proof of the invalidity of shirk has been established to them.)" (3)

The Sheikh – once again – confirmed the falsehood of this claim and that it is a lie and slander in his response to a question from the Sharif... (4)

As for lies and slander, such as their claim that we declare general takfir (declaring someone a disbeliever), require people to migrate to us if they are able to manifest their religion, or declare takfir on those who do not declare others as disbelievers or fight, and many other similar accusations, all of these are lies and slander intended to turn people away from the religion of God and His Messenger. (5)

The Sheikh [Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab] sent a letter to one of the scholars of Medina to refute the false accusation of declaring people disbelievers in general. The Sheikh said:

“If someone claims that we declare general takfir, we respond: Glory be to You, this is a great slander. We only declare takfir on those who bear witness that monotheism is the religion of God and His Messenger, that calling upon anyone other than God is false, and then after that they declare the people of monotheism to be disbelievers.” (6)

The Sheikh wrote to Ismail al-Jara'i, a scholar from Yemen, refuting this fabrication. The Sheikh said:

“As for the claim that we declare general takfir, this is one of the slanders of the enemies who try to turn people away from this religion. And we say: Glory be to You, this is a great slander.” (7)

When one of the scholars of Iraq, Sheikh Abdul Rahman bin Abdullah al-Suwaidi, sent a letter to the Sheikh asking about what people were saying about him—that he declares all people disbelievers except for those who follow him—the Sheikh responded, mentioning the plots of the enemies, and then refuted the slander of the opponents:

“They attacked us with the horses of Satan, spreading slanders so absurd that a rational person would be embarrassed to even repeat them, let alone invent them. Among these lies is the claim that I declare all people to be disbelievers except for those who follow me, and that I claim their marriages are invalid. How astonishing that such an idea could even enter the mind of any rational person! Could a Muslim, a disbeliever, a scholar, or even a madman say such a thing?” (1)

Sheikh Hussein bin Ghannam refutes the accusation that Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab declared Muslims to be disbelievers and affirms that it was the opponents who declared the Sheikh a disbeliever and made his blood lawful. He said, describing the Sheikh:

“When that movement became apparent in those times, and people's hearts were filled with love for sins and disobedience, and they were preoccupied with what they were doing in terms of disobedience and evil desires, there was not a single tongue that rushed to declare them [the Arabs] disbelievers, nor did any mind or heart of his determine to declare them disbelievers. Rather, he refrained from taking such a step, being cautious in this matter, until all the enemies rose against him, shouting and proclaiming his takfir (declaring him a disbeliever) and that of his group in all lands. They persisted in their slander and lies, and continued their aggression, while he never ordered bloodshed or fighting for most of the differing opinions and errors.” (2)

Sheikh Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab refuted this fabrication, saying:

“As for the lies attributed to us to cover up the truth and deceive the people, such as the claim that we declare all people to be disbelievers in general, those of our time and after the six-hundredth year, except those who follow our path, and that we do not accept anyone's allegiance unless they acknowledge that they were previously a polytheist and that their parents died as polytheists—there is no basis for this claim. All of these falsehoods and similar ones, when we were first asked about them, we responded to each one with: ‘Glory be to You, this is a great slander.’ Whoever attributes any of these things to us or claims that we hold such views has lied and slandered us. Anyone who has witnessed our situation, attended our gatherings, and become certain of what we actually believe knows for certain that all of these things were invented and slandered against us by the enemies

of the religion and the companions of Satan, to turn people away from submitting sincerely to the oneness of God in worship and abandoning all forms of polytheism. We believe that anyone who commits major sins, such as killing a Muslim without right, committing adultery, usury, or drinking alcohol repeatedly, does not leave the fold of Islam because of these actions, nor will they be condemned to eternal punishment if they die as monotheists who worship only God.” (3)

Also demonstrating their innocence from this false claim is what Sheikh Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab said in another context:

“As for the author of **Al-Burda** and others who have polytheistic statements and excessive religious zeal in their words, and who have died, we do not judge them as disbelievers. The duty is to denounce these statements and clarify that anyone who outwardly believes in such statements is a polytheist and a disbeliever. However, as for the speaker [who has passed], his affair is referred to God Almighty. It is not appropriate to pass judgment on the dead because it is unknown whether they repented before their death or not.” (4)

When Sheikh Abdul Aziz bin Hamad, the grandson of Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab, was asked about this false accusation, he responded, after presenting the question:

“As for your second question regarding whether we consider those who are not under our leadership or part of our state to be in the land of disbelief and war in general, etc. We say, with the help of God: What we believe and hold as our religion is that anyone who

follows Islam and obeys their Lord in what He has commanded and refrains from what He has forbidden, is a Muslim, whose wealth and life are inviolable, as the Quran, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah indicate. We do not declare anyone who follows Islam to be a disbeliever just because they are not part of our group or under our state. Rather, we only declare those to be disbelievers whom God and His Messenger have declared disbelievers. Whoever claims that we declare people to be disbelievers in general, or that we require migration to us for those able to manifest their religion in their own lands, has lied and slandered.” (1)

Among the powerful arguments written by Sheikh Abdul Latif bin Abdul Rahman bin Hassan, which silenced the false claim made by Uthman bin Mansur that Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab declared Muslims to be disbelievers and killed them, Sheikh Abdul Latif wrote in **Misbah al-Zalam** to refute this: (This statement indicates recklessness in lying and complete audacity. In the hadith, it is said: "Among the things that people have inherited from the first words of prophethood is: If you feel no shame, then do as you wish.") (2)

This statement clearly implies that Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab declared all the Ummah, from the time of the Prophet's mission until the Day of Judgment, as disbelievers unless they agreed with his specific views. Is it conceivable for any rational person who knows the Sheikh's condition and what he brought and called for, to believe this? Even the people of innovation, such as the Qadariyyah, Jahmiyyah, Rafidah, and Khawarij, do not declare all those who disagree with them to be disbelievers. Rather, they

have specific statements and details that scholars know. The Sheikh, may God have mercy on him, did not have any unique view that he differed in from the rest of the Ummah or from the people of Ahl al-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah. All his statements in this matter—meaning his call to monotheism in names and attributes, and monotheism in actions and acts of worship—are agreed upon by the Muslims, and only those who have deviated from their path disagree with him. (3)

Sheikh Abdul Latif explains his grandfather—the Imam Sheikh's—caution in declaring takfir, saying: "Sheikh Muhammad, may God have mercy on him, was among the most hesitant and restrained people in declaring others as disbelievers. He did not even assert the disbelief of the ignorant person who calls upon other than God from among the people of the graves or others if there was no one to advise him and present him with the evidence that, if it reached him, would make him a disbeliever." (4)

In one of his letters, Sheikh Abdul Latif presents the belief of the Imam Sheikh on the issue of takfir, saying:

"He did not declare takfir except for what the Muslims unanimously agreed upon in declaring its doer a disbeliever, such as major shirk, disbelieving in the verses of God and His messengers, or any part of it after the evidence had been established and conveyed to him, such as declaring those who worship the righteous and call upon them along with God, making them equals in what God alone deserves in worship and divinity." (5)

Sheikh Abdul Latif confirms that anyone who knows the biography of Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab will realize his innocence from this false accusation, saying—may God have mercy on him:

"Any rational person who knows the biography of Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab, may God have mercy on him, knows that he was one of the most reverent people towards knowledge and scholars, and among the most adamant in warning against declaring them as disbelievers, belittling them, or harming them. Rather, he was one of those who upheld their reverence, honored them, and defended them, urging people to follow their path. The Sheikh, may God have mercy on him, did not declare anyone a disbeliever except those whom God and His Messenger declared as disbelievers and those whom the Ummah unanimously agreed upon as disbelievers, such as those who take gods and equals to the Lord of the Worlds." (1)

Sheikh Abdul Latif bin Abdul Rahman bin Hassan refuted the false accusation of takfir in his debate with Dawud bin Jirjis, saying:

"As for the claim that we declare all people disbelievers and obligate migration to us for those who are able to manifest their religion, and that we declare takfir on those who do not declare others as disbelievers or do not fight, and many more such claims—this is all lies and slander intended to turn people away from the religion of God and His Messenger. Glory be to You, this is a great slander." (2)

Sheikh Saleh bin Muhammad al-Shatri refutes their lies, saying:

"As for what his contemporary enemies claimed, that he declared general takfir, or that he declared people disbelievers for committing sins, or that he fought those who did not deserve to be fought, or that he made their blood and wealth lawful—our response is to say: Glory be to You, this is a great slander. The letters of Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab clearly refute what his enemies attributed to him, and that his doctrine was the doctrine of the righteous predecessors (salaf al-salih)." (3)

Sahsawani summarizes the response to the lies of Dahlan, who falsely accused Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab, saying:

"All of this is undoubtedly slander against the Sheikh, known to anyone who possesses even the slightest amount of faith, knowledge, and reason." (4)

He also says—after mentioning other slanders of Dahlan, who accused the Sheikh of declaring people disbelievers:

"The answer to all these statements, despite their length and abundance, is that they are all false and wicked. So do not be impressed by the abundance of evil." (5)

Sahsawani refutes Dahlan's claims against the Sheikh's call regarding the issue of takfir, saying:

"The Sheikh and his followers did not declare any Muslim a disbeliever, nor did they believe that they alone were the Muslims and that those who opposed them were polytheists. They did not permit the killing of Ahl al-Sunnah or the taking of their women as captives. I met more than one scholar among the Sheikh's followers and read many of their books, and I found no trace of these claims. Rather, all of this is slander and fabrication." (6)

Muhammad Rashid Rida commented on the previous words, saying:

"On the contrary, these books contain the opposite of what was mentioned. They state that they do not declare anyone a disbeliever unless they commit something that is considered disbelief by the consensus of Muslims." (7)

Sheikh Sulayman bin Sahman defended the Sheikh Imam, clearing him of this slander, saying—may God have mercy on him, while describing the Sheikh:

"He, may God have mercy on him, was upon what the Messenger of God, peace be upon him, his companions, and the righteous predecessors were upon. He did not declare anyone a disbeliever except those whom God and His Messenger declared disbelievers and those whom the Ummah unanimously agreed upon as disbelievers. He allied himself with all Muslims and their scholars, and he believed in what was stated in the Quran, the authentic hadiths, and what was clearly prohibited, including the prohibition of the blood, wealth, and honor of Muslims. He only permitted what the Sharia permitted and what the Messenger of God, peace be upon him, nullified.

Whoever attributed to him anything contrary to the beliefs of the people of Ahl al-Sunnah

wa'l-Jama'ah from the righteous predecessors and their scholars has lied and slandered."

(1)

Ahmad al-Kitlani wrote in **As-Sa'ib al-Hattal** in defense of the Sheikh on this issue, similar to

what Ibn Sahman wrote. (2)

One of the scholars of Najd responded to this slander, which was adopted by the editor of the

Al-Qibla newspaper, who claimed that the Wahhabis force people to declare their ancestors disbelievers.

The scholar responded:

(This is of the same nature as the previous falsehoods and lies. What we say in this matter is that if someone from among the polytheists died before this call reached him, and it is known that he practiced shirk and followed it, and died in that state, then outwardly it appears that he died in disbelief. Therefore, no prayers should be made for him, no sacrifices should be made on his behalf, nor should charity be given in his name. However, the truth of his situation is left to Allah. If the evidence had been presented to him during his life and he obstinately rejected it, then he is a disbeliever both outwardly and inwardly. But if the evidence had not been presented to him, then his affair is with Allah. As for someone whose condition during his life is unknown and we do not know what he died upon, we

do not declare him a disbeliever, and his affair is with Allah. Whoever attributes to us anything other than this has lied about us and slandered us. Sufficient for us is Allah, and He is the best disposer of affairs.) (3)

Sheikh Muhammad bin Uthman al-Shawi refutes this slander in his letter **Al-Qawl al-Asad**, saying:

(We do not declare people disbelievers in general, nor do we declare anyone a disbeliever unless there is conclusive evidence of his disbelief, such as directing God's exclusive rights to others, praying to or seeking refuge in someone who cannot benefit or harm himself, let alone others...) (4)

Al-Qasimi, in his book **Al-Sira'**, attacks the Sheikh's opponents—specifically the Rafidah—affirming the innocence of the Sheikh from the accusation of declaring others disbelievers. He argues that these Rafidah are more deserving of such a description, saying:

(It is one of the strange and humorous ironies of time that the Shia accuse the Ahl al-Sunnah, particularly the followers of Sheikh Muhammad bin Abd al-Wahhab, of declaring Muslims disbelievers and making their blood and wealth lawful, while the Shia themselves publicly and openly declare the best of the Ummah, the foremost of the companions, and those who followed them among the various Muslim sects as disbelievers. And those who declare the best of the companions, like Abu Bakr, Umar,

Uthman, Aisha, and Muawiyah—among others—disbelievers, how is it that they are not ashamed to accuse others of declaring Muslims disbelievers...) (5)

From these various quotes, it becomes clear that the Sheikh Imam, along with his followers and supporters of his call, are innocent of the fabrications and lies of their opponents regarding the issue of takfir. Anyone who reads their books and letters will see the correctness of their beliefs and their sound understanding of the matter of takfir, and that their belief aligns exactly with that of the righteous predecessors (Salaf al-Salih).

The Second Treatise: The False Accusation that the Wahhabis are Kharijites and that Najd al-Yamama is the “Horn of Satan,” with a Response and Refutation

This discussion is closely related to the previous one. In the previous section, we addressed the false claim that Wahhabis declare other Muslims as disbelievers. In this section, we discuss the false claim that Wahhabis are Kharijites. There is overlap between the two discussions because the Kharijites are known for declaring sinful Muslims as disbelievers. Hence, opponents have likened the Wahhabis to the Kharijites in this regard.

We will not go into detail on this aspect since the previous section provides sufficient discussion. Instead, we will focus on the false accusation that Wahhabis are Kharijites and on the criticism they receive for allegedly being Kharijites—marked by the sign of head-shaving—as well as the claim that their homeland, Najd, is the “Horn of Satan,” the land of Musaylima the Liar, and other such baseless allegations. We will then refute and disprove these claims.

The Opponents’ Allegations

The opponents have put forth various false accusations against Wahhabism. Some claim that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab was a Kharijite and that one of their signs is shaving their heads. Others criticize him and his movement because their homeland is Najd al-Yamama, which they claim is the “Horn of Satan” mentioned in the hadith and a land of earthquakes and tribulations. Some even allege that he was a descendant of Dhu’l-Khuwaysira al-Tamimi.

One of the earliest people to make this accusation was Ibn Afaliq, who condemned the Wahhabis by pointing out that their homeland was Najd—the “Horn of Satan”—and that they were remnants of the tribulation of Musaylima the Liar. In his letter to Ibn Mu‘ammar, Ibn Afaliq wrote:

“The virtue of the people of Sham, Yemen, the Haramain, and Persia is well known to anyone with even basic knowledge of hadith. But as for you, O people of Yamama, the authentic hadith states that from your land, the ‘Horn of Satan’ will rise, and you will continue to suffer evil from your liar until the Day of Judgment. Indeed, in this is a lesson for those who have insight.”

He further states:

“How will they respond, given their state and their claims? Do they believe in reincarnation and say that Musaylima has reappeared in Wadi Hanifa? For the Prophet ﷺ said in a well-known hadith that they will remain in tribulation from their liar until the Day of Judgment.”

Similarly, Sulayman ibn Abd al-Wahhab argued against his brother’s movement by pointing out that his homeland was in the east, the land of Musaylima the Liar. He said:

“One of the proofs that invalidate your doctrine is what is recorded in Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim on the authority of Abu Huraira (RA), that the Prophet ﷺ said: ‘The head of disbelief is in the east.’ If he knew that the lands of the east—especially Najd, the land of Musaylima—would later become a land of faith and that the victorious group would emerge there, while the Haramain and Yemen would turn into lands of idolatry requiring migration away from them, he would have informed us of that. He would have supplicated for the people of the east, particularly Najd, and he would have supplicated against the Haramain and Yemen, disavowing them. However, he did the opposite, as he generalized about the east and specifically mentioned Najd, stating that from it, the ‘Horn of Satan’ will emerge.”

Another critic, al-Haddad, echoed these accusations, claiming that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab himself was the “Horn of Satan.” In his book *Misbah al-Anam*, al-Haddad wrote:

“Scholars have derived from the Prophet’s ﷺ statement ‘from it will emerge the Horn of Satan’ an indication of his prophethood, for he used the letter ‘ya’ (indicating the future). This is because Musaylima, may Allah curse him, appeared during the Prophet’s lifetime and claimed prophethood, and he perished during the caliphate of Abu Bakr. However, the true ‘Horn of Satan’ did not appear until the year 1150 AH, in the person of Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, the founder of this innovation.”

Al-Haddad further cited some characteristics of the Kharijites, falsely claiming they applied to the Wahhabis. He stated:

“Most importantly, the Prophet ﷺ described the Kharijites with many characteristics, all of which prove that Ibn Abd al-Wahhab and his followers are among them—such as their

being from Najd, their being from the east (as Najd is east of Medina), and their distinguishing mark of shaving their heads.”

Al-Haddad also quoted the scholar al-Man‘ami, who responded to the Wahhabis’ practice of killing those who did not shave their heads, saying in a poem:

“Is there an authentic hadith in my grandfather’s chain

That commands shaving my head with a knife?”

Another critic, Abd al-Ra’uf, cited the hadith: “O Allah, bless our Sham and our Yemen,” along with hadiths regarding the Kharijites, and then proceeded to argue against the Wahhabis.

The Accusation Against the Followers of Ibn Abd al-Wahhab and Their Alleged Affiliation with the Kharijites

The opponents of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab have fabricated numerous allegations against his followers, claiming they are Kharijites. One of these accusations is that their defining characteristic is shaving their heads completely and avoiding leaving any hair, unlike the traditional Arab practice. They assert that when someone joins their movement, the first requirement is to shave their head entirely. This, they claim, is a distinguishing mark of the Wahhabis compared to other Arabs, making the hadith about “shaving heads” a direct reference to them.

The scholar al-Sawi falsely asserts that the scholars and followers of this movement are Kharijites and misquotes the Qur’anic verse: “And they think they are upon something; indeed, they are the liars” as if it applies to them.

Similarly, Ibn Abidin, in his commentary, falsely claims that the followers of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab fall under the category of the Kharijites.

Another critic, Muhsin ibn Abd al-Karim, fabricates accusations against the followers of this Salafi movement, describing them as the “renegades” (al-mariqa). He also propagates the claim about head-shaving, stating:

“Shaving the head has become their distinguishing sign. They do not accept anyone into their group unless they shave their head first. Al-Mawla Abdullah ibn Isa, in his book *Al-Sayf al-Hindi*, reported that he heard of 600 men from Tihama who shaved their heads by the light of a lamp in a single night. So imagine what happens in the daytime!”

The extreme Rafidi (Shia) al-Laknawi resorts to vile insults, falsely asserting that the Wahhabis are ideological descendants of the Kharijites. He says:

“They follow the example of their predecessors, the extremist Kharijites, whom Allah cursed, as they declared Amir al-Mu’minin Ali ibn Abi Talib and all his companions disbelievers based on false arguments similar to those of the Wahhabis. They thereby justified spilling their blood and seizing their wealth.

If you examine their history with keen insight, you will find that the Wahhabis follow the same path as the Kharijites in their beliefs. If you delve deeper, you will find that the leaders of those Kharijites originated from Najd.”

Another critic, Uthman ibn Mansur, repeats the claim that Najd al-Yamama is the “Horn of Satan.” He states:

“The Prophet ﷺ refrained from praying for Najd when he prayed for Sham, Yemen, and Medina. This was because, through divine knowledge, he knew what would emerge from there. He said: ‘There will be earthquakes and tribulations there, and from it will emerge the Horn of Satan.’”

Ahmad Dahlan, known for his fabrications, falsely claims that the supporters of this Salafi movement imposed head-shaving on their followers:

“They ordered anyone who followed them to shave their head and would not allow them to leave their gathering until they had done so. No previous misguided sect ever enforced such a practice. The hadith explicitly refers to them. The scholar Abdul Rahman al-Ahdal, the Mufti of Zabid, used to say: ‘There is no need for a book refuting Ibn Abd al-Wahhab. It is enough to quote the Prophet’s ﷺ statement: “Their distinguishing mark is shaving their heads,” for no other group of innovators practiced this except them.’”

The Shia scholar Muhammad Hasan al-Mousawi falsely accuses the Wahhabis of following the path of the Kharijites. He also fabricates the claim that:

“The Wahhabis are the people of earthquakes and tribulations as explicitly mentioned by the Prophet ﷺ.”

The poet al-Nabhani claims that Najd al-Yamama is the “Horn of Satan” and that it belongs to the eastern lands condemned by the Prophet ﷺ. In his short poem, he writes:

“The Prophet pointed to the East in condemnation,
And its people are the ones who brought forth evil.

From it, Satan rises, striking the heads of guidance,
But Allah will surely crush him to pieces.”

The writer al-Dajawi, in his magazine Al-Azhar, falsely attributes eleven characteristics of the Kharijites to the followers of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, unjustly labeling them as such.

The extreme and deceitful Rafidi, known as Al-Amili, falsely claims that the Wahhabis resemble the Kharijites in thirteen ways. He also cites hadiths criticizing the East and Najd, insisting that these apply to Najd al-Yamama. Additionally, he attempts to exonerate his homeland, Iraq, from being considered Najd and refutes the Wahhabi interpretation that Najd refers to Iraq. He argues:

“Some Wahhabis claim that ‘Najd’ in the hadith refers to Iraq because it is higher in elevation than the Hijaz, and that ‘Najd’ in Arabic refers to any elevated land. However, this claim is clearly false, as the term ‘Najd’ has always specifically referred to their land. It has never been known by any other name, neither in the past nor in the present.”

Al-Amili goes even further in his fabrications, alleging that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab is from the same tribe as Dhu’l-Khuwaysira al-Tamimi, the Kharijite who opposed the Prophet ﷺ. He claims:

“One of the narrations referring to the Wahhabis is the Prophet’s ﷺ statement about Dhu’l-Khuwaysira al-Tamimi: ‘From his progeny will come a people who recite the Qur’an, but

it will not go beyond their throats.’ The meaning of ‘his progeny’ refers not to his direct descendants, but to his tribal lineage and kin. Since Dhu’l-Khuwaysira and Ibn Abd al-Wahhab both belong to the Banu Tamim tribe, they are from the same origin and lineage.”

Refutation of Allegations Against Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and His Followers

The critic al-Zahawi claims that one of the signs of the prophethood of Muhammad ﷺ was his foretelling of these so-called “Kharijites,” referring to the followers of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab.

Likewise, Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Ghumari falsely asserts that the movement of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab is the “Horn of Satan,” saying:

“When the Horn of Satan emerged in Najd at the end of the 11th century and its tribulation spread, people began applying the relevant hadiths to him and his followers.”

Abu Zahra repeats this lie without caution or verification, claiming that the followers of this movement:

“Resemble the Kharijites, who declared sinners to be disbelievers.”

Similarly, the Shia scholar Muhammad Jawad Mughniya falsely claims that Wahhabis are no different from the Kharijites in their approach to takfir (declaring others as disbelievers).

However, this mountain of lies fabricated by the opponents of the Salafi movement ultimately crumbles and vanishes, like ashes scattered by the wind on a stormy day, when examined in light of the clear arguments and decisive evidence presented by its followers.

The critics falsely accused Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab of declaring Muslims disbelievers due to sins, but he explicitly refuted this claim. In his letter to the people of Qassim, he wrote:

“I do not declare any Muslim a disbeliever for committing a sin, nor do I expel him from the fold of Islam.”

Even Imam al-Shawkani, although initially unaware of verified information about this Salafi movement, did not believe the false claims against it. He stated:

“Some people allege that he holds the beliefs of the Kharijites, but I do not think this is true.”

Sheikh Hamad ibn Nasser ibn Muammar was once asked: “Is it true that you declare people disbelievers for committing sins?” He responded:

“This is not our belief. This is the belief of the Kharijites, who declare sinners disbelievers. We do not declare anyone a disbeliever for committing sins. However, we do declare disbelief upon those who commit acts that are explicitly considered kufr (disbelief), such as associating partners with Allah—by worshiping others alongside Him, calling upon others instead of Him, offering sacrifices to them, making vows to them, fearing them, hoping in them, or placing reliance upon them. All of these are acts of worship that should be directed to Allah alone, as stated in the Quran.”

Refuting the Allegation About Head-Shaving

Sheikh Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab refutes the fabricated claim that his followers enforced head-shaving as a religious obligation or a test of allegiance. He clarifies:

“As for the claim that some Bedouins who joined our movement fought those who refused to shave their heads, or that people were killed solely for refusing to shave, or that failing to shave was considered apostasy—this is utterly false. Apostasy is only determined by the denial of fundamental Islamic beliefs. The types of disbelief and apostasy are well-known to scholars, and refraining from shaving one’s head is not among them. In fact, we never even declared head-shaving as a recommended act, let alone a religious obligation, let alone something that, if abandoned, would constitute apostasy.

We never ordered any rulers to fight those who refused to shave their heads. Rather, we commanded them to fight those who associated partners with Allah and refused to embrace His oneness.”

Sheikh Abdul Aziz ibn Hamad, the grandson of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, further clarifies the issue of head-shaving in a response:

“Hadiths indicate that shaving some parts of the head while leaving others is prohibited. However, leaving the hair completely is permissible if one takes care of it, as indicated by the Sunnah.

As for the hadith of Kulayb (which mentions shaving upon entering Islam), if it is authentic, it merely suggests that shaving is a one-time act when embracing Islam. It does not imply that continuing to shave the head is a religious practice.

As for punishing those who refuse to shave their heads or confiscating their wealth—this is impermissible, and those who do so should be reprimanded. Leaving the hair unshaved is not prohibited in itself. However, local rulers discouraged it as a precautionary measure because shaving was the common custom in our region, and only foolish individuals refused to follow it. Thus, it was prohibited as a form of discouragement, not as an absolute religious ruling. Additionally, since the disbelievers of our time do not shave their heads, not shaving became a form of imitation.”

The Meaning of “Najd” and the “Horn of Satan” Hadith

Sheikh Abdul Rahman ibn Hasan provides a decisive response to those who misuse the hadith about Najd being the “Horn of Satan.” He explains that the hadith’s condemnation refers to a specific condition, not a geographical location. He elaborates:

“The condemnation in the hadith applies to the prevailing conditions of a place, not the place itself. The hadith stating: ‘O Allah, bless our Yemen and bless our Sham’—with Najd being omitted—has been explained by scholars to refer to Najd al-Iraq, as one version of the hadith explicitly mentions ‘the East,’ and Iraq lies to the east of Medina. The historical record confirms this, rather than the claim that it refers to Najd in the Hijaz.

Those knowledgeable in history and Islamic sources are well aware of the numerous conflicts and tribulations that have taken place in Iraq, such as the emergence of the Kharijites, the martyrdom of Husayn, the revolt of Ibn al-Ash’ath, the uprising of al-Mukhtar (who falsely claimed prophethood), and the oppressive rule of al-Hajjaj ibn Yusuf.”

In summary, the accusations against Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and his followers—whether regarding takfir, head-shaving, or the misinterpretation of the Najd hadith—are baseless and refuted by both historical facts and the statements of the scholars of the movement itself.

Refutation of Misconceptions About Najd and the Salafi Movement

Sheikh Abdul Rahman bin Hasan clarifies that condemnation applies to circumstances rather than places, and divine will can change the spiritual status of a location. He states:

“Condemnation applies to conditions rather than places, and this can vary over time depending on the inhabitants. While locations may differ in virtue, divine decree circulates among people and even among lands. A place of sin at one time may become a place of obedience at another, and vice versa.”

He further explains:

“If Najd were to be condemned solely because of Musaylimah, even after his demise and the disappearance of his followers, then Yemen would also be condemned for the emergence of al-Aswad al-Ansi and his false claim to prophethood. Yet, this did not harm the city of Madinah, despite Jews residing there before it became the migration destination of the Prophet ﷺ, the stronghold of Islam. Similarly, Makkah was not condemned for its people’s rejection of the Prophet ﷺ and their hostility toward him. Rather, it remained the most beloved land to him.”

Response to Accusations of Kharijism

Sheikh Abdul Rahman bin Hasan refutes the claims of Uthman bin Mansur, who labeled the followers of this movement as Kharijites and misapplied hadiths about the Kharijites to them. He responds:

“As for the followers of this Islamic call, which Allah brought forth in Najd, spreading widely and being acknowledged by many scholars and intellectuals—while invalidating the arguments of those who opposed them with mere testimonies—by the grace of Allah, they call to what the messengers were sent with: the sincere worship of Allah alone, with no partner.”

He also asserts elsewhere that the view of the adherents of this movement regarding the Kharijites aligns with that of the Companions.

Clarification on the Meaning of “Najd” and “the East” in Hadith

Sheikh Abdul Latif bin Abdul Rahman bin Hasan explains the reference to “the East” and “Najd” in the hadith:

“The ‘East’ and ‘Najd’ mentioned in this hadith and others refer to Iraq, as it lies directly east of Madinah. This is clarified by variations of the hadith that explicitly mention Iraq.

Al-Khattabi said: ‘Najd lies to the east. For those in Madinah, their Najd is the Syrian desert and its surrounding areas, which form their eastern region.’ The term ‘Najd’ originally refers to any elevated land, in contrast to ‘Ghawr,’ which denotes lowlands.

Al-Dawudi stated that Najd refers to Iraq, as cited by Ibn Hajar. Supporting this is the narration in Sahih Muslim from Ibn Umar, who said: ‘O people of Iraq! How often do you inquire about minor matters while committing great sins? I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say: The tribulation will come from here, and he pointed towards the east.’

It is evident that this hadith specifically refers to Iraq, as the Prophet ﷺ clarified through physical indication. Furthermore, al-Mu'jam al-Kabir by al-Tabarani explicitly names Iraq as the intended location. Ibn Umar's statement, linguistic evidence, and historical context all affirm this interpretation."

The Merit of Banu Tamim and Najd

Sheikh Abdul Latif highlights the virtues of Banu Tamim, stating:

"Regarding the excellence of Najd, particularly the tribe of Tamim, Sahih al-Bukhari records that Abu Hurairah رضي الله عنه said: 'I love Banu Tamim for three reasons, which I heard from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ: When their charity was brought, he said, This is the charity of my people. When their female slave was presented, he said, Set her free, for she is from the descendants of Isma'il. And he said, They are the staunchest of my nation against the Dajjal.

This refers to their specific merits. As for the general merits of the Arabs, there is no doubt that they include the people of Najd, as they are pure Arabs. Moreover, the narrations extolling certain tribes and peoples are more explicit in demonstrating the virtues of their inhabitants than those praising lands and places.

It is well known that the leaders of the grave-worshippers—who promote supplications to and veneration of graves—share traits with the Dajjal. Many men from Tamim and Najd have opposed these false claimants who call for the veneration of graves alongside Allah. This is among the signs of the prophethood of Muhammad ﷺ, particularly if we interpret al- in the Dajjal as generic rather than specific. If we assume the Dajjal refers to the individual known by

this title, then combating these falsehoods serves as preparation for resisting him and refuting his deceptions. Reflect on this carefully—it is highly insightful.”

Response to Those Criticizing Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab for Being from the Land of Musaylimah

Sheikh Abdul Latif rebuts those who attempt to discredit Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab by associating him with the land of Musaylimah:

“None reviles our Sheikh for coming from the land of Musaylimah except those who also disparage the great Imams and shining lights of guidance due to past instances of shirk and manifest disbelief in their homelands. Extending such logic would embolden attacks against the prophets and the most esteemed believers.

This critic resembles a foolish goat seeking its own demise, unaware of the consequences of its actions.

Some scholars from al-Azhar once said: Musaylimah the Liar is among the best of your people of Najd. I responded: And Pharaoh the accursed is the head of your people of Egypt. The man was left speechless. If only they understood—how much worse was Pharaoh’s disbelief compared to Musaylimah’s?”

Response to Criticism of Najd al-Yamamah as the Land of Najda al-Haruri and the Qarmatian

Sheikh Abdul Latif responds to the claims of Ibn Mansur, who criticized Najd al-Yamamah by alleging it was the land of Najda al-Haruri and the Qarmatian, stating:

Sheikh Abdul Latif refutes the accusations against Najd al-Yamamah, where some have claimed that it is discredited due to figures such as Najda al-Haruri and the Qarmatian leader. He states:

“If Najd were to be condemned for once housing Najda al-Haruri or the Qarmatian, then Egypt would likewise be condemned for having Pharaoh, Iraq for its infamous heretics and deviants, and other lands for their past misguidance. This logic is invalid, as places do not bear permanent disgrace due to past inhabitants. Rather, judgment is based on the faith and deeds of those who reside there at a given time.”

He highlights how Islamic history demonstrates that lands once dominated by disbelief later became centers of faith:

“Consider how Makkah itself was the center of idolatry before Islam, yet it became the holiest site after the Prophet ﷺ purified it. Likewise, Madinah housed Jewish tribes before becoming the city of the Prophet and the capital of the first Muslim state. The cycles of faith and misguidance in any land do not define its absolute status; rather, it is the beliefs and actions of the people at any given time that matter.”

Sheikh Abdul Latif emphasizes that the true distinction lies in adherence to Tawheed, not geographical history:

“The measure of a place’s virtue is in its people’s commitment to monotheism. If a land is inhabited by those who uphold Islam in its purest form, striving against shirk (polytheism) and bid’ah (religious innovations), then it is a place of honor, regardless of what occurred there before.”

Final Words on the Accusations Against the Salafi Movement

The claims that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and his followers are Kharijites, that Najd is inherently evil, or that their movement is a deviation from Islam are all refuted by clear evidence. The scholars defending this movement clarify:

1. They do not excommunicate (takfir) Muslims for sins, contrary to the claims made against them. They affirm that major sins do not remove a person from Islam unless they involve explicit acts of shirk.
2. The condemnation of “Najd” in hadith refers to Iraq, not the Najd of the Arabian Peninsula, as proven by linguistic, historical, and contextual evidence.
3. Past misguidance in a land does not permanently condemn it, as shown by the transformation of Makkah and Madinah into Islamic centers despite their pre-Islamic history.
4. Banu Tamim and the people of Najd are praised in authentic hadith, demonstrating their virtue rather than condemnation.
5. The Salafi movement calls for pure monotheism and the rejection of all forms of polytheism and innovation, in line with the teachings of the Prophet ﷺ and the understanding of the Companions.

Sheikh Abdul Latif, along with other scholars of the movement, repeatedly demonstrated that the accusations against Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and his followers were baseless. Instead, they proved that the movement was a revival of pure Islamic teachings, calling people back to the original creed of Islam, free from distortions, innovations, and false accusations.

Sheikh Abdul Latif continues to refute the accusations against Najd and its people, emphasizing that the presence of historical figures like Najda al-Haruri or the Qarmatian leader in certain areas does not condemn those regions or their later inhabitants. He states:

“Claiming that Najda was from this land and that his heresy originated here is falsehood and slander, as Najda developed his innovation and rebellion in Iraq, where he settled, and it became his homeland. Moreover, it has been established that he repented when Ibn Abbas debated him. As for the Qarmatian, his lands were in Qatif and Al-Khatt, which are not within the borders of Yamamah, nor even within the borders of Najd. Even if he were from Najd or Yamamah or the town of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, what harm would there be in that?

Has Allah or His Messenger ever condemned anyone based on their homeland or origin, whether they were Persian, African, or Egyptian from the land of Pharaoh and his tyranny? Ikrimah, the son of Abu Jahl, was one of the most virtuous Companions, yet his father was the ‘Pharaoh of this nation.’”

Sheikh Sahsawani, in his book *Siyanat al-Insan*, examined the narrations regarding “Najd, the horn of Satan” and collected scholars’ interpretations of the term “Najd” in this context. He then stated:

“It is evident that none of the wordings of this hadith imply that everyone born in the east is included in its warning.

The mere occurrence of tribulations in a place does not necessitate condemning all its inhabitants. This is evidenced by the hadith narrated by both Bukhari and Muslim, in which

Usama ibn Zayd reported that the Prophet ﷺ stood on one of the fortresses of Madinah and said: ‘Do you see what I see? They said: No. He said: I see trials falling upon your houses like raindrops.’”

After mentioning other relevant hadiths, he concluded:

“These and similar hadiths indicate that tribulations will occur even in Madinah, the Prophet’s city. If the occurrence of tribulations in a place were enough to condemn its inhabitants, then all the residents of Madinah would be condemned, which no one would claim. Furthermore, both Makkah and Madinah were once centers of idolatry and disbelief. What greater tribulation is there than that? In fact, every land or village has, at some point, been a site of tribulation or will become one in the future. So how can any believer dare to condemn all Muslims of the world? Rather, condemnation is directed at specific individuals based on their actions, such as being sources of trials through disbelief, polytheism, or innovations in religion.”

Sahsawani also presented evidence proving that the “Najd” mentioned in the hadiths about tribulations refers to Iraq, which lies east of Madinah.

Regarding the claim that followers of the Salafi movement enforced head shaving, he dismissed it, saying:

“This is an outright lie and a shameful falsehood.”

Mawlana Mahmud Shukri Al-Alusi, a scholar from Iraq, acknowledged the tribulations that emerged from his homeland, which he identified as the true “Najd, the horn of Satan”:

“It is no surprise that the land of Iraq has always been the source of every trial and calamity. The people of Islam have suffered one disaster after another from it. The Khawarij of Harura and their impact on Islam are well known. The tribulation of the Jahmiyyah, whom many of the early scholars considered outside the fold of Islam, emerged and spread from Iraq. The Mu’tazila, who confronted Al-Hasan Al-Basri with their deviant beliefs, also originated in Basra. Likewise, the Rafidah (Shia) and their excesses concerning the Ahl al-Bayt, their blasphemous statements about Imam Ali and other imams, and their insults toward the greatest of the Companions—all of this is well known and widespread.”

Sheikh Ibn Sahman unequivocally declared his rejection of the Khawarij in poetry:

“We disavow the creed of the Khawarij, for they
Declared all monotheists disbelievers over mere sins.
They deemed this to be faith, out of their foolishness,
And their extremism in religion is of the severest kind.

We also renounce every creed that opposes truth and guidance,
That is not upon the path of the Prophet Muhammad.”

Ibn Sahman also refuted the slander of Al-Haddad, who claimed that the people of Najd were descendants of Musaylima the Liar. He affirmed that Iraq, not Najd, is the true land of tribulations, as it lies east of Madinah. He said:

“The forefathers of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and their ancestors were once upon ignorance, idolatry, and the worship of idols and stones. Yet no one is blamed for

the sins of their forefathers, for Allah brings forth from the loins of disbelievers and polytheists those who become His closest allies and chosen ones.”

He further clarified:

“The homeland of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab was Yamamah, and Yamamah is not east of Madinah. Rather, east of Madinah lies Iraq and its surroundings. Yamamah is also not centrally located between Madinah and Iraq; rather, it is east of Makkah.”

Sheikh Abdul Karim ibn Fakhr al-Din al-Hindi exposed the distortions of Ahmad Dahlan and refuted his claims. Addressing Dahlan’s claim that the Najd of the Arabian Peninsula is the “horn of Satan,” he said:

“Look at how he has twisted and distorted the words of the Messenger ﷺ, rendering their true meaning null and void. The commentators of the hadiths explicitly mention in their explanations the murder of Uthman, the Battle of the Camel and Siffin, and the emergence of the Khawarij—all of which took place in Iraq. Yet Dahlan deliberately misrepresented the hadith’s meaning. Moreover, the emergence of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab’s movement falls outside the events mentioned in those narrations.”

Abdul Karim also says:

“As for what has been reported regarding the Khawarij and their sign being head shaving, this does not apply to what has been claimed. Leaving hair and having a full head of hair was a Sunnah among Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and his followers. If this narration is authentic, it would only apply to those newly entering Islam, as the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: ‘Remove from you the hair of disbelief.’”

Nasir al-Din al-Hijazi, in *Al-Nafkha*, explains the meaning of “the east” while refuting the false claims of Al-Iskandarani, stating:

“The term ‘east’ is a general name, extending to where the sun rises. Many tribulations have emerged from there, such as the trials caused by Genghis Khan, Hulagu, and later the Tatars. The calamities extended, and countless Muslims were killed. What justifies singling out those poor individuals who travel the land seeking their livelihood in a lawful manner?”

Hijazi also refutes the false claim regarding head shaving, saying:

“As for what has been mentioned about head shaving, that is nothing more than a mythical tale, O Umm Amr.”

Sheikh Hakim Muhammad Ashraf Sandhu (may Allah have mercy on him) wrote an independent treatise titled *Akmal al-Bayan fi Sharh Hadith Najd Qarn al-Shaytan*, in which he compiled the narrations of this hadith, cited the statements of hadith commentators regarding its meaning, and also referenced the views of linguists and geographers. Based on this evidence, he concluded that the intended “Najd, the horn of Satan” refers to Iraq. He summarizes his findings as follows:

“The intent of the hadiths is that the lands located to the east of Madinah are the source of tribulations, corruption, disbelief, atheism, and the origin of innovation and misguidance. If one carefully examines a map of the Arabian Peninsula, it becomes clear that the land lying to the east of Madinah is none other than Iraq—home to Kufa, Basra, and Baghdad.”

In another passage, he states:

“Hadith commentators, linguists, and experts in Arabian geography unanimously agree that ‘Najd’ is not the name of a specific country or a particular town. Rather, it is a term used for any elevated piece of land that rises above its surroundings.”

Sheikh Hamud al-Tuwaijri, in his book *Idah al-Mahajjah*, refuted the false claims of Al-Ghumari, stating:

“All the narrations regarding the emergence of the ‘horn of Satan’ from the east are from Abdullah ibn Umar (may Allah be pleased with him), and in some of them, he explicitly states that ‘the east’ refers to the land of Iraq. This completely invalidates the arguments of those who falsely claim that the hadith refers to the people of the Arabian Peninsula.”

When Al-Ghumari claimed that the emergence of the “horn of Satan” in Najd referred to Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, Al-Tuwaijri responded:

“This is nothing but a blatant lie and clear falsehood, for he attributed to them a disgraceful characteristic that does not apply to them but to others. Allah says:

‘And those who harm believing men and believing women for something they did not do, they bear a burden of slander and clear sin.’ (Surah Al-Ahzab: 58)

The scholars of Islam have testified that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab revived the Tawhid (Oneness of Allah), renewed the religion, and called to it. They have acknowledged his knowledge, virtue, and guidance, and have praised him in both poetry and prose.”

The esteemed scholar Nasir al-Din al-Albani commented on the hadith “O Allah, bless our Sham and our Yemen...” after compiling its various chains and reports:

“From the sum of the hadith’s narrations, it is evident that ‘Najd’ in the narration of Al-Bukhari does not refer to the region known by that name today. Rather, it refers to Iraq. This was the understanding of Imam Al-Khattabi and Hafiz Ibn Hajar Al-Asqalani.

The truthfulness of the Prophet’s words has been confirmed by history. Many of the major tribulations originated from Iraq, such as the conflicts between Ali and Mu’awiyah, between Ali and the Khawarij, and between Ali and Aisha, among others, all of which are documented in history books. This hadith is thus among the prophetic miracles and signs of his truthfulness.”

Dr. Abdul Bari Abdul Baqi refutes the claim that Wahhabis are Khawarij, stating:

“Unlike the Khawarij, the Wahhabis never disassociated themselves from Uthman and Ali (may Allah be pleased with them).”

Al-Qasimi refutes the false claim regarding head shaving—often cited as a sign of the Khawarij—and denies its applicability to the Wahhabis, saying:

“This claim is invalid and rejected. The argument behind this claim is that some of the people of Najd shave their heads. However, the critics fail to understand that ‘the sign of a people’ means a distinguishing feature that sets them apart from others and by which they are uniquely recognized.

If a characteristic is common among different groups of people, it can no longer be considered a distinguishing sign of a particular sect. Likewise, head shaving cannot be a defining trait of anyone today, because shaving the head is practiced by many different nations across the Muslim world. Thus, it cannot be considered an exclusive sign of the people of Najd.”

Al-Qasimi refutes the claim of the Rafidi Al-Amili that the Wahhabis are Khawarij, stating:

“The Wahhabis truthfully and sincerely testify that those whom the Khawarij declared disbelievers—such as Ali, Uthman, Mu’awiyah, and the other Companions and Tabi’un who agreed with them—are among the best of mankind, the most truthful in religion, faith, conduct, and sincerity.”

The Misconception That the Wahhabis Introduced New Acts of Disbelief

In this section, we present what some opponents have written in opposition to the positions established by the scholars of the Salafi movement. These opponents have claimed that Imam Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and the supporters of his call have introduced into the nullifiers of Islam things that do not belong there. They also assert that the acts which Shaykh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab confirmed as expelling a person from the fold of Islam are not, in reality—according to them—acts of disbelief, but rather fall short of that.

If we were to trace the statements of these opponents on this issue, the discussion would become extensive and limitless. However, through careful examination of their statements and references, it becomes evident that the main reason for this disagreement lies in the differing understanding of what constitutes disbelief that expels a person from Islam. There is a clear difference between the scholars of the Salafi movement and these opponents in defining the boundaries of major disbelief (kufr akbar) versus minor disbelief (kufr asghar). The scholars of the Salafi movement have established the nullifiers of Islam, clarified them, and distinguished major disbelief from minor disbelief, basing their conclusions on the texts of the Qur’an, the Sunnah of the Prophet, and the statements of the righteous predecessors.

However, these dissenting opponents have deviated from the path of the believers. They have failed to grasp the true definition of disbelief that expels one from the faith and have not properly understood what constitutes such disbelief. Consequently, they have confined disbelief to a very narrow scope, excluding many acts that the textual evidence and logical proofs confirm as acts of disbelief. They do not consider these acts to be nullifiers of Islam.

The opponents have fallen into confusion and a deficient understanding of the reality of disbelief due to their ignorance of the true nature of monotheism (tawhid). Because they failed to fully grasp the concept of tawhid and did not understand it correctly, and because they remained ignorant of certain essential aspects of tawhid, they developed an incomplete perception of it. Additionally, their adherence to customs, traditions, and blind imitation contributed to their failure to recognize some characteristics of disbelief. As a result, these opponents engaged in some acts of disbelief themselves and led the general public into the depths of polytheism (shirk) and its impurities. Then, when confronted with the truth by those who understood it, they rejected it and opposed those who had a correct understanding of tawhid and its contradictions.

The flawed and incomplete perception of tawhid among these opponents is that they believe that the only form of monotheism required of every accountable individual is the monotheism of lordship (tawhid al-rububiyyah). According to them, whoever acknowledges that Allah is the Creator, Sustainer, Controller, Giver of life and death, and so on, is considered a monotheist. Due to ignorance and blind following, they have assumed that the meaning of the testimony of faith—La ilaha illa Allah—is merely affirming that Allah is the Creator and has the power to bring things into existence. They have ignored or deliberately overlooked the fact that the term ilāh (deity), by the consensus of linguistic scholars, exegetes, and jurists, means “the one who is worshipped.” Thus, the true meaning of the testimony of faith is: “There is no deity worthy of

worship except Allah.” This necessitates directing all forms of worship exclusively to Allah and negating them from anything else.

It is as if these misguided individuals do not realize that the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) fought the polytheists of Arabia despite their acknowledgment of the monotheism of lordship. The reason for this was their rejection of the monotheism of worship (tawhid al-uluhiyyah); they did not recognize or affirm that Allah alone is worthy of all forms of worship, and they continued to direct acts of worship to their idols, stones, and false deities.

One of the clearest evidences that the polytheists whom the Prophet (peace be upon him) fought already acknowledged that Allah is the Creator, Sustainer, Giver of life and death, and Controller of all affairs—yet this acknowledgment did not enter them into Islam—is the verse in which Allah says:

Say: Who provides for you from the sky and the earth? Or who owns hearing and sight? And who brings forth the living from the dead and brings forth the dead from the living? And who manages affairs? They will say: “Allah.” So say: Will you not then fear Him? (Surah Yunus 10:31)

This form of monotheism—tawhid al-rububiyyah—which the polytheists of Arabia accepted but which did not make them Muslims, is regarded as the ultimate goal by these dissenting opponents.

The Misconception That the Wahhabis Introduced New Acts of Disbelief

We will present examples from their own books to clarify what we previously mentioned, demonstrating that their understanding of Tawhid al-Rububiyyah (monotheism of Lordship) is

their main focus. They claim that only contradicting this form of Tawhid constitutes disbelief (kufr). According to them, if someone commits acts that are actual nullifiers of Islam—such as sacrificing for other than Allah, making vows to other than Allah, or seeking help from created beings in matters that only Allah can handle—this does not render them apostates, as long as they believe that Allah alone controls the universe.

We will then present further examples from their writings where they justify these acts of disbelief—or classify them as mere sins rather than major disbelief that expels one from Islam. They permit acts such as sacrificing for other than Allah, making vows to other than Allah, and calling upon and seeking assistance from others besides Allah. They also object to the stance of the scholars of the Salafi movement on these matters. After that, we will present the responses and clarifications from the leading scholars of this Salafi movement refuting these claims.

Ibn ‘Afaliq describes Tawhid according to their perspective, stating:

“Tawhid is distinguishing the Eternal from the created and affirming His Lordship and Oneness, differentiating Him from all of His creation...” (2)

Al-Qabbani denies that the early polytheists acknowledged Tawhid al-Rububiyyah in order to defend the polytheists of his time who seek help from others besides Allah in matters that only He can control. He states:

“Have you ever heard of anyone among those who seek help from others believing that the Prophet (peace be upon him) or the saint they call upon is a deity alongside Allah, possessing independent power to harm, benefit, or intercede, just as the polytheists believed about those they worshipped?” (3)

Muhammad ibn Abdul-Majid makes a similar claim, arguing that the polytheists of Arabia did not acknowledge Allah's Lordship. He states:

“The people of Jahiliyyah were deemed disbelievers for worshipping idols because they believed that these idols possessed some of the attributes of Lordship... From this perspective, their shirk and disbelief arose, because Allah's attributes must be unique, with no equivalent that exists within His Essence or within any other being.” (4)

He then argues that if the polytheists of Arabia denied some aspects of Lordship—as he falsely claims—then:

“How does this compare to a Muslim seeking help from a Prophet or a saint while believing that they have no independent power to benefit or harm?” (5)

Al-Haddad defends his followers—who venerate graves—by stating:

“No matter how much they revere the Prophets and saints, they do not believe about them what they believe about Allah, the Exalted, in terms of complete and absolute creation. Rather, they see them as having favor with Allah in a particular matter and attribute their influence to them metaphorically, while still believing that the origin and ultimate power belong to Allah alone.” (1)

Dahlan asserts that shirk is only when one believes in the independent power of something other than Allah. He claims:

“What constitutes shirk is believing in the divinity of something besides Allah or attributing independent power to anything besides Him.” (2)

He further states:

“No Muslim believes in the divinity of anything besides Allah, nor does anyone believe that anyone other than Allah has independent power.” (3)

Al-Zahawi affirms that the early polytheists believed that their idols could benefit and harm independently. He states:

“The polytheists only became disbelievers because they believed that angels, prophets, and saints were deities alongside Allah, capable of causing harm and benefit independently.” (4)

Al-‘Amili attempts—without evidence—to argue that the Arab polytheists denied Allah’s Lordship. He also tries to refute what Imam Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab decisively established in his works *Kashf al-Shubuhāt* and *Four Principles*—which affirm that the Arab polytheists acknowledged Allah’s Lordship. Al-‘Amili states, in a weak defense of his followers who share the same belief in *Tawhid al-Rububiyyah* as the polytheists:

“There is nothing that proves that the Arab polytheists did not believe their idols and false gods had an effect on the universe and that only Allah had the ultimate power. It is possible that they believed these idols had independent influence apart from the verses cited as evidence, that they could heal the sick and remove harm...” (5)

Al-Shatti defines major shirk only as “worshipping idols and statues” (6). He also recounts an anecdote about his grandfather:

“Once, my grandfather entered the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus and heard an elderly woman saying:

‘O Sayyid Yahya, heal my daughter.’

He found the wording problematic and inappropriate in relation to divine etiquette. He advised her, saying:

‘My sister, say: O Allah, by the rank of Sayyid Yahya, heal my daughter.’

She replied:

‘I understand, I understand. But he is closer to Allah than I am.’

This response clarified that her belief was sound, that Allah alone is the One who acts, and that her words were merely a form of tawassul (seeking intercession) and mediation to Allah for the fulfillment of her request.” (7)

The Shiite scholar Muhammad Hussein exonerates his Shiite sect and those who follow their misguided path, such as the grave worshippers, and declares their innocence from shirk al-rububiyyah (the polytheism of Lordship), saying:

“Do you think that anyone visiting graves believes that the grave around which they are walking, or the deceased in it, is their creator and sustainer? Or that they are saying to others or to those inside: ‘O my creator, my sustainer, my god’ ... No, certainly not... I do not believe that anyone would think such things.” (1)

Muhammad al-Taher shuts the door to apostasy and negates the nullifiers of Islam when he says:

“If something is attributed to other than Allah in the speech of Muslims, it must be interpreted figuratively, and there is no way to declare any Muslim an apostate... So, if a lay Muslim says, ‘The Prophet (peace be upon him) benefited me,’ or ‘The companion or saint benefited me,’ he only intends a figurative attribution, and the evidence for this is that he is a Muslim, a monotheist, who believes that only Allah has the power to influence, not anyone else.”

(2)

Based on the quotes of these opponents, slaughtering for other than Allah, making vows to other than Allah, and seeking help from the dead are not considered acts of shirk (polytheism) that take one out of Islam, as long as the person committing them believes that Allah is the only one acting and having influence. This is how these people understand it. Below are their statements from their books, confirming this view and strongly criticizing those who oppose them in their misguidance and deviations.

Ibn 'Afaliq, denying that slaughtering or making vows to other than Allah is shirk, says:

“The entire ummah has agreed that slaughtering or making vows to other than Allah is forbidden, and anyone who does so is disobedient to Allah and His Messenger. The reason scholars did not declare them apostates is because they did not do this believing that the idols were equals to Allah.” (3)

Ibn Suhaym attacks Sheikh Imam for declaring apostasy against those who slaughter for other than Allah, saying:

“One of the things he does is decisively declare as an apostate anyone who slaughters an animal and names Allah over it, but also claims that it is for driving away the evil of jinn. He says this is kufr and the meat is forbidden.” (4)

Sulaiman ibn Abdul-Wahhab criticizes declaring apostasy for those who slaughter or vow to other than Allah and is astonished by declaring someone an apostate for invoking others besides Allah:

“Where do you get the idea that a Muslim, who bears witness that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad is His Messenger, is an apostate if they invoke someone who is absent or dead, or make a vow to others besides Allah, or slaughter for someone other than Allah? How can this be the greatest shirk, causing their deeds to be nullified, and their wealth and life to be forfeit?” (5)

Sulaiman says:

“The scholars never said that someone who seeks from others than Allah is an apostate, nor did they say that someone who slaughters for others than Allah is an apostate...” (6)

Muhammad ibn Muhammad al-Qadri permits seeking help from others besides Allah as long as the person doing so does not believe that anyone besides Allah is the creator and that no one has any influence except Allah. He says:

“Saying ‘O my master Ahmad’ or ‘O Sheikh so-and-so’ is not shirk, because the intent is to seek intercession and help... No Muslim doubts that when they believe that a saint like Ahmad or any other saint can do something, such as resolving a matter or providing assistance, it is only through Allah’s will and power.” (1)

Al-Haddad considers the prohibition on making vows to saints as fabricated by Sheikh, saying:

“As for the Najdi’s ruling prohibiting all vows to the great ones, this is a fabrication against the books of Shari’ah and his compounded ignorance.” (2)

Muhsin ibn Abdul-Karim, in his book *Lafhat al-Wajd*, praises one of the Sheikh’s opponents:

“He then affirmed that shirk in supplication is not the greatest shirk, and that the one who commits it does not exit the fold of Islam after having entered it.” (3)

Abdullah ibn Hussein Balfaqih al-‘Alawi wrote a treatise in response to the Imams of the Salafi movement on this issue, to prove that invoking others besides Allah is not the greatest shirk. (4)

Likewise, Dawood ibn Jargis claims that invoking the dead, seeking help from the absent, and slaughtering or making vows to others besides Allah is not shirk. (5)

Ja’far al-Najafi argues for the permissibility of slaughtering for other than Allah, saying:

“The people of Islam have been doing this since ancient times, slaughtering for the prophets and saints...” (6)

The Shiite scholar al-‘Amili claims the permissibility of seeking help from others besides Allah, saying:

“If someone says in their supplication and seeks help from others besides Allah, ‘Pay my debt, heal my sick, or grant me victory over my enemy,’ there is nothing wrong with this, let alone something that would require shirk and takfir because it is understood that the Muslim who believes that others besides Allah have no ability to benefit or harm themselves or anyone else.” (7)

Al-Shatti rejects that seeking help from others besides Allah is shirk, as is stated by the Salafi Imams. He narrates the belief of the Wahhabis on this matter:

(For they explicitly state that anyone who seeks help from the Prophet (peace be upon him) or anyone else for their needs, or calls upon them for their requests and objectives, even saying “O Messenger of Allah,” or believes in a deceased prophet or saint and makes them an intermediary between him and Allah for his needs, is a polytheist whose blood and wealth are lawful...) (8)

Then, Muhammad ibn Alawi al-Maliki, in the wake of this stumbling caravan, claims: “One is only considered an apostate if they believe in the creation and origination of things by others besides Allah.” (9)

To respond to this objection and remove the doubts of the opponents, we remind initially—based on what we have previously stated—that these opponents have limited their understanding of the reality of tawhid (monotheism), making the tawhid al-rububiyah (the monotheism of Lordship) the ultimate goal of tawhid, and that it is the duty of the accountable person. Thus, they have narrowed their concept of shirk (polytheism)—which contradicts tawhid—by limiting it to the belief that creation and origination belong to anyone other than Allah, or that benefit and harm come from anyone other than Him.

As for the scholars of this call and their followers, they have fully comprehended and understood both the reality of tawhid and the reality of shirk.

Therefore, it is appropriate to mention the definition and interpretation of the greatest shirk, which encompasses its types and forms—as determined by some scholars of the call:

“(The greatest shirk is when a servant directs a type or form of worship to other than Allah. So, every belief, statement, or action that is mandated by the Lawgiver, if it is directed solely to Allah, is tawhid, faith, and sincerity; if it is directed to anyone else, it is shirk and kufr.)” (1)

For example, Allah has commanded slaughtering for Him and dedicating it solely to His sake, as is clearly stated in the Qur’anic texts about prayer. Allah has mentioned slaughtering alongside prayer in several places in His Book. If it is established that slaughtering for Allah is one of the greatest acts of worship and obedience, then slaughtering for anyone other than Allah is the greatest shirk that takes one outside the fold of Islam. (2)

Similarly, making vows is an act of worship. Allah praised those who fulfill their vows, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) commanded fulfilling vows of obedience. Allah also commanded seeking His help in every hardship and difficulty. Directing these acts to anyone other than Allah is shirk and blasphemy. (3)

As for the opponents’ claim that the polytheists of the Arabs believed that their idols were capable of benefit and harm, the Qur’anic texts refute this false claim—as we have already mentioned some of them. It suffices to refer to His saying:

“Say, ‘To whom belongs the earth and whoever is in it, if you should know?’ They will say, ‘To Allah.’ Say, ‘Then will you not be reminded? Say, ‘Who is Lord of the seven heavens and Lord of the great throne?’ They will say, ‘To Allah.’ Say, ‘Then will you not fear Him? Say, ‘In whose hand is the dominion of all things, and He protects and none can protect against Him, if you know?’ They will say, ‘To Allah.’ Say, ‘Then how are you deluded?’” (4)

Those whom the Prophet (peace be upon him) fought acknowledged that no one but Allah can benefit or harm, and they acknowledged that their idols—whether statues or saints—do not manage or create anything, and that benefit and harm come from Allah alone.

Thus, the belief of these ignorant people—grave worshippers—who slaughter for saints, make vows to them, or seek help from the dead, while thinking they are Muslims simply because they believe that Allah is the only One who has influence, is clearly the same as the belief of the polytheists of the Arabs. (5)

To demonstrate that invoking others besides Allah, seeking help from saints and the like, slaughtering for others than Allah, and making vows to others than Him are all types of the greatest shirk that take one outside the fold of Islam, we present some of what the Imams of the call have written in response to the doubts of those opponents.

Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul-Wahhab provides a clear answer to the doubt of Ibn Suhaym, who believed that making vows to other than Allah is forbidden but not shirk. The Sheikh responds to this and addresses Ibn Suhaym:

“Your proof is their statement that making vows to others than Allah is forbidden by consensus, and you have deduced from their saying ‘forbidden’ that it is not shirk. If that is the extent of your reasoning, how can you claim to have knowledge? Woe to you! What do you make of the statement of Allah: ‘Say, “Come, let me recite what your Lord has prohibited you from: that you not associate anything with Him, and to parents, good treatment...”’ (1) Does this not indicate that shirk is forbidden and not just a sin, as you ignorant one are claiming? What do you make of the statement of Allah: ‘Say, “My Lord has only forbidden immoralities—what is apparent of them and what is concealed—and sin, oppression without right, and associating with

Allah that for which He has not sent down authority...” (2), up to the verse: ‘And that you not associate with Allah that for which He has not sent down authority’? (3) Does this prohibition not imply that its perpetrator is an apostate? Woe to you! In which book did you find it stated that something being forbidden does not mean that it makes one an apostate? You claim that their saying ‘forbidden’ does not mean apostasy, but that is a lie and slander against the scholars. It is stated that it is forbidden, but as for whether it is kufr, that requires another proof. The evidence is clear in the book al-Iqna’ where it is mentioned that making vows is an act of worship. And it is known that ‘there is no god but Allah’ means that no one is worshipped except Allah...” (3)

The Sheikh, the Imam, presents an important rule in his response to those who claimed that slaughtering for the jinn is prohibited but is merely a sin, not apostasy. He says:

“His statement: ‘Slaughtering for the jinn is prohibited,’ know the rule that the people of your time have neglected, which is that the terms ‘forbidden’ (tahrim), ‘disliked’ (karahah), and ‘it is not appropriate’ are general terms used for things that are lesser than apostasy, for prohibitions that are less than kufr and for tanzih (discouraged actions) that are less than forbidden, like their usage in the mufakkarat (concepts or reflections): saying, ‘There is no god but the One to whom worship should be directed,’ and Allah’s statement, ‘And it is not appropriate for the Most Merciful to take a son.’ (5) The term ‘forbidden’ is like the verse: ‘Say, “Come, let me recite what your Lord has forbidden to you: that you not associate anything with Him...”’ (6), and the scholars’ statements are not limited to their saying ‘this is forbidden’ because they have explicitly stated in other places that it is kufr. And their saying ‘disliked’ is like Allah’s saying, ‘And your Lord has decreed that you not worship except Him...’ (6), up to the verse: ‘All of that was evil in the sight of your Lord, abhorrent.’ (7) As for Imam Ahmad’s saying, ‘I dislike such and such,’ it is understood by his companions to mean ‘forbidden.’ When

you understand this, they have stated that slaughtering for the jinn is kufr and that the slaughtered animal is prohibited, even if the name of Allah is mentioned.” (8)

Sheikh Hamad bin Nasser bin Ma'mar confirms the ruling on seeking help from anyone other than Allah:

“We know by necessity that the Prophet (peace be upon him) did not legislate for his nation to call upon the dead, neither the prophets nor the righteous nor anyone else, neither using the term ‘seeking help’ nor any other form. Rather, we know that he forbade all of this, and that it is from the greatest shirk that Allah and His Messenger have prohibited. Allah said, ‘And that the mosques are for Allah, so do not invoke with Allah anyone else.’ (9) ‘And do not invoke with Allah another deity, lest you be among the punished.’ (6)”

He continues:

“Thus, anyone who calls upon a dead person from among the prophets or the righteous, or calls upon the angels or the jinn, has called upon one who cannot help them, and who has no power to remove harm or change it.” (6)

Sheikh Hamad bin Nasser bin Ma'mar (may Allah have mercy on him) explains the two types of invoking other than Allah, then responds to some objections raised by opponents who sought to justify invoking others than Allah, believing it was not kufr. He said:

“Know that asking others than Allah and seeking help from them are of two types. The first is asking the present living for what they are capable of, such as asking them to pray for you, or support you, or assist you. This is permissible, as the companions would ask the Prophet

(peace be upon him) for intercession during his lifetime, and he would intercede for them, and they would ask him to pray for them, and he would pray for them.

The second type is asking the dead, the absent, or others for what only Allah can do, such as asking for the fulfillment of needs and the removal of hardships. This is from the prohibited actions, and is unanimously recognized as kufr by the Imams of Islam... This is something that is known by necessity to not be from the religion of Islam.” (6)

He also said:

“As for the statement of the one who claims that the general declaration of kufr for invoking others than Allah is not established, this is false for several reasons. The first reason: there is no explicit text on this specific issue. This is false, for the texts are explicit in declaring as kufr anyone who calls upon anyone other than Allah, making for Allah a partner from among His creation, calling upon them as one calls upon Allah, and relying upon them for all their affairs. Allah said, ‘Then those who disbelieved in their Lord make equals to Him.’ (1)”

And he says elsewhere:

“Furthermore, many of the issues that the scholars have mentioned concerning apostasy and disbelief, and over which there is consensus, have no explicit texts declaring them as kufr. Rather, the scholars derive these rulings from the generality of the texts...” (3)

Then Sheikh Hamad bin Nasser bin Ma'mar responds to another objection:

“As for the second claim, if we examine it from the standpoint of the statement, it is like swearing by other than Allah, which has been declared shirk and kufr. Then they interpreted it as lesser than that...”

We say: This is false speech, and the difference between them is clear. What similarity is there between one who worships Allah alone, does not associate anyone with Him, places all his needs before Allah, and seeks His help in relieving his distress, but swears an oath by other than Allah, a mere oath that does not intend to elevate the one sworn by above Allah, and one who seeks help from someone other than Allah, asking them to bring benefits or remove hardships? The latter is a clear misdirection of worship, which is the essence and core of it, to someone other than Allah...

The author of Al-Tawdhih clarifies the confusion among the opponents and removes the misunderstanding concerning vows made to someone other than Allah. He explains the difference between making a vow to commit a sin and making a vow for the sake of someone other than Allah, and illustrates how shirk is realized in making vows to others than Allah. The author of Al-Tawdhih says:

“An invalid vow is of two types:...”

One of them: a vow to commit a sin, such as drinking alcohol, killing a protected person, or fasting on the day of Eid, and it is forbidden to fulfill it. This is based on the saying of the Prophet (peace be upon him): “Whoever makes a vow to disobey Allah, let him not disobey Him.” This is because disobeying Allah is never permitted under any circumstances.

The second: a vow to someone other than Allah, such as a vow to Ibrahim the Khalil, or Muhammad the unlettered Prophet (peace be upon him), or Ibn Abbas, or Abdul Qadir, or Al-Khidr, etc. There is no disagreement among the scholars of Islam who are to be followed that this is an act of associating partners with Allah, because the person who makes such a vow does so believing that the one to whom the vow is made has the power to harm, benefit, give, and prevent, either by their own nature or through their influence, and that they can bring good and blessings and remove evil and hardship. The proof of the belief of these vow-makers and their shirk is that they say they were in great difficulties, so they made a vow to such and such a figure, an owner of a grave, from the prophets or righteous people, or to such and such a cave or tree, and their hardships were relieved, and their hearts found ease. They firmly believe that these vows are the reason for achieving their desires and removing their fears. Anyone who reflects on the Qur'an, the Sunnah of the Prophet (peace be upon him), and the state of the righteous predecessors will understand that this vow is similar to what the polytheists made for their idols in the verse: "This is for Allah according to their claim, and this is for our partners."

Sheikh Abdullah Abu Batain responds to the grave-worshippers' claim that calling upon the dead is metaphorical, and that Allah alone is the true one to be asked. He says: "As for the claim that calling upon the dead and asking them to fulfill needs is metaphorical, and that Allah alone is truly the one to be asked, this is indeed the statement of the polytheists: 'These are our intercessors with Allah,' and 'We only worship them so that they bring us closer to Allah.'" They ask intermediaries, claiming they intercede for them with Allah in fulfilling their needs. Shaykh al-Islam Taqi al-Din (may Allah have mercy on him) said: "Whoever places intermediaries between him and Allah, calling upon them, relying upon them, and asking them, is a disbeliever by consensus."

Sheikh Abdul Latif bin Abdul Rahman bin Hasan confirms that directing certain acts of worship to others than Allah is shirk, as stated by the great scholars, and the scholars of this movement have followed their methodology. He says: “As for declaring takfir (excommunication) on those who allow calling upon others than Allah, relying on others, and taking intermediaries between the servants and Allah to fulfill their needs, relieve their hardships, and aid them in their distress, the scholars’ words on this matter and the takfir of those who do this are too numerous to count and detail. Many of the great scholars of Islam have agreed on this, and we follow their way in this. We do not declare takfir except on those whom Allah and His Messenger have declared to be disbelievers, and the authentic texts of the scholars have made clear that those who associate others with Allah, who alter His attributes, or who believe that the souls of righteous people or saints have control and management along with Allah, are disbelievers. Allah is far above what the wrongdoers claim.”

Mahmoud Shukri Al-Alusi speaks about the state of those who make vows to those they believe are righteous, and mentions that they believe the one they make a vow to can benefit and harm, give and prevent. Al-Alusi mentions the evidence for this belief, saying: “The proof of their belief is their statement: ‘We were in hardship, and we made a vow to so-and-so, and our difficulty was alleviated.’ Some of them say: ‘The waves overwhelmed us, so I called upon Sheikh so-and-so, and made a vow to him, and our ship was saved.’ You will find them, when they do not fulfill their vows and experience some harm, being told: ‘Fulfill your vow, or else so-and-so will do such and such to you.’ They rush to fulfill it, even if they have to borrow money, even if they are in debt or in difficulty, and sometimes they may die while still in debt, all out of fear of the one to whom the vow was made, seeking his approval. Is this not a sign of their poor belief and weak faith? When criticized, their only response is that they say: ‘Our intention

is that they intercede for us.’ But the intercession they speak of does not cross their hearts, and they only know that the one to whom the vow was made is the one who fulfills their needs and prepares their desires.”

Al-Alusi recounts the statements of scholars confirming that slaughtering for someone other than Allah is considered major shirk that takes one out of the faith, and he says: “From all these quotes, it has become clear to you that whoever offers a sacrifice to someone other than Allah, with the intent of removing harm or bringing benefit, is committing the same disbelief and shirk as the early polytheists.”

Al-Bayan Al-Mufid states the following: “We believe that worshiping others than Allah is major shirk, and that calling upon others than Allah, especially the dead and absent ones, and loving them as one loves Allah, fearing them as one fears Allah, hoping in them as one hopes in Allah, is major shirk. Whether one calls upon them as an act of worship or calls upon them in times of distress or ease, calling upon someone other than Allah is the essence of worship, and believing that something other than Allah has control over what is beyond the ability of created beings is major shirk. Anyone who exalts others than Allah, seeking their help in matters that only Allah can handle, such as seeking victory in wars without the strength of armies or seeking happiness in the Hereafter or this world through means that Allah has not prescribed, is committing major shirk.”

And we remind, at the conclusion of this discussion, that the principles established by the scholars of the Salafi movement and their supporters on the nullifiers of Islam and the various acts that lead to disbelief, causing a person to exit and sever from the religion of Islam, are not something invented by them. Rather, they are in adherence to the texts of the Qur’an, the

authentic Hadith, and the consensus of the Companions, the Tabi'un, and the recognized scholars from the four schools of thought.

Chapter Four:

The Objection of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab's Alleged Contradiction with Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim on This Issue:

Presentation and Rebuttal

Some opponents of the Salafi call believe that what the Imams of this movement have determined as nullifiers of Islam, such as slaughtering for others than Allah, making vows to others than Allah, and seeking help from others than Allah, among other acts of worship directed to others than Allah, contradicts the views of Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allah have mercy on him) and his student Ibn Qayyim (may Allah have mercy on him). These opponents claim that these two scholars did not categorize slaughtering for others than Allah, making vows to others than Allah, and seeking help from the dead as major shirk that takes one out of the fold of Islam.

These opponents have attempted to hold onto every text or statement attributed to Ibn Taymiyyah or Ibn Qayyim that they believe, based on their misguided understanding and incorrect perceptions, shows that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab contradicted Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim regarding the issue of takfir (declaring someone a disbeliever). In doing so, they aim to convince themselves and their followers that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab was at odds with the rest of the Muslim community and its scholars, even to the extent that he contradicted Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Qayyim, whom Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab

frequently cited and referenced in his works. Their failed attempts have led them to distort texts, change their meanings, and misinterpret them, as will be clarified below.

We will present the claims made by these opponents, the texts they quote from the two scholars, and the arguments they use to claim that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab opposed them. We will limit our discussion to some examples that they provided, followed by a rebuttal and refutation.

Ibn Aflaq presents an answer from Ibn Taymiyyah regarding seeking help from the Prophet (peace be upon him), in which Ibn Taymiyyah, according to his narration, said: “If seeking help means asking the Prophet (peace be upon him) for what is appropriate, there is no dispute among Muslims about this. Whoever disputes this meaning is a disbeliever, if he denies what leads to disbelief, or he is a mistaken misguided person.” Then Ibn Aflaq commented, “Look at this precious statement, and pay attention to his saying: ‘If seeking help...,’ this is the case of one who denies seeking intercession through him (the Prophet), who is between disbelief and misguidance. How about the one who denies it and says, ‘Whoever says, O Messenger of Allah, is a disbeliever; and whoever does not declare him a disbeliever is also a disbeliever!’”

Ibn Aflaq also criticizes Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab, saying, “The reason this man has fallen into this great trap is that he looks at the books of Ibn al-Qayyim, picks what agrees with his desires, and ignores what contradicts him, taking from the beginning of a chapter and leaving its end.”

Ibn Aflaq also says: “He (Ibn Taymiyyah) regarded the statement of al-Busiri: ‘O most honorable of creation, to whom do I turn... except you, when the calamities are overwhelming,’ as a form of major shirk. This is a blatant lie, unless he is quoting from the scholars; otherwise, it is a

fabrication from him. Ibn al-Qayyim, despite his bias and opposition to the entire ummah in this matter, considered this statement as part of minor shirk. Look at his books, like ‘Sharh al-Mazhab’ in the chapter on minor shirk and ‘Ighathat al-Lahfan’.”

We notice that in his letter, Suleiman ibn Abdul Wahhab, in most of his writing, aimed to express that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab contradicted what Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim wrote, as much of his letter revolves around presenting the views and quotes of the two scholars. Then, he follows those quotes with his own interpretation, concluding that these scholars did not declare takfir on someone who slaughtered, made vows, or sought help from others than Allah.

Suleiman ibn Abdul Wahhab says: “Taqi al-Din (Ibn Taymiyyah) said: ‘Making a vow to the graves, to the people of the graves, or to Ibrahim al-Khalil (peace be upon him), or to Sheikh so-and-so, is a vow to commit disobedience, and it is not permissible to fulfill it. However, if the vow is fulfilled by giving charity to those who deserve it, such as the poor or the righteous, it is better for the one who made the vow in the sight of Allah and more beneficial.’ If the one making the vow was a disbeliever, he would not have commanded him to give charity because charity is not accepted from a disbeliever; instead, he would have ordered him to renew his Islam and said, ‘You have exited Islam by making a vow to other than Allah.’ The Sheikh also said: ‘Whoever vows to light a lamp for a well, a cemetery, a mountain, or a tree, or vows to them or their residents, it is not permissible, and the vow should not be fulfilled. Rather, it should be spent in public interests, as long as the person does not recognize his Lord.’ If the one making the vow were a disbeliever, he would not have commanded him to annul his vow but would have ordered him to be killed. The Sheikh also said: ‘Whoever vows to offer a lamp to the Prophet (peace be upon him) should give it to the neighbors of the Prophet (peace be upon him).’”

Then Suleiman ibn Abdul Wahhab says: “Look at his words, consider them, did he declare the one who did this to be a disbeliever, or did he declare the one who did not declare him a disbeliever to be a disbeliever, or did he count this as one of the things that nullify Islam, as you say?”

Ibn al-Qayyim also mentioned vows to other than Allah in the section on minor shirk in his book *Al-Madarij* and supported it with the hadith narrated by Ahmad from the Prophet (peace be upon him): “Vowing is an oath.” He also mentioned others whom you consider to be committing shirk and declare them disbelievers in the section on minor shirk. As for slaughtering for other than Allah, he mentioned it among the forbidden acts but did not mention it among the acts that nullify Islam, except when slaughtering for idols or what is worshiped other than Allah, such as the sun and the stars. Shaykh Taqi al-Din also considered it a forbidden act, cursed the person who does it, like one who alters the landmarks of the earth. Shaykh Taqi al-Din also said: “As the ignorant people do in Mecca, may Allah honor it, and other Muslim lands by slaughtering for the jinn. Therefore, the Prophet (peace be upon him) prohibited slaughtering for the jinn.” He did not say, “Whoever does this is a disbeliever, and whoever does not declare him a disbeliever is a disbeliever,” as you claim.

Then came Dawood bin Jirjis, who distorted the words of the two Shaykhs, changing and altering them in order to permit some types of shirk with Allah. He compiled these various quotes and placed them in a book titled *Sulh al-Ikhwan min Ahl al-Iman wa Bayaan al-Din al-Qayyim fi Tabri’at Ibn Taymiyyah wa Ibn Qayyim*.

We will present some of his quotes from the two Shaykhs, which he uses to argue for the permissibility of invoking the dead and seeking help from them. One of these quotes from Dawood is:

Quote 13: Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allah have mercy on him) said in his book *Al-Furqan*:

“We find that many of these people base their belief in someone being a wali of Allah because he has had an unveiling or some miraculous acts, or that some of them sought his help while he was absent or dead, and he came and fulfilled their need, or he informed them of something that was stolen from them, or the condition of someone absent or ill. None of these things prove that the one who experiences them is a wali of Allah. Rather, the friends of Allah agree that if a man flew in the air or walked on water, one should not be deceived by him until his following of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) is examined, and his obedience to his commands and prohibitions. The miracles of the friends of Allah are greater than such things.”

Dawood then says: “Look at his words, especially his statement: ‘Some of them sought his help while he was absent or dead, and he came and fulfilled their need.’ This implies that this event occurs as a form of *karama* (miracle), and it is used as evidence of the saintliness of the person, but only if the one being called upon follows the command of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) and complies with his prohibitions. Al-Iraqi said: ‘Thus, it becomes clear that the Prophet (peace be upon him), his companions, the successors, and those after them from the saints, may be believed to be a means of guidance because of invoking them, whether they are absent or dead, and this occurs as a *karama*.’ It is known that a *karama* does not come from a forbidden action, so if seeking help was forbidden, the Sheikh and others would not have considered it a *karama*, but rather a delusion.”

Iraqi also quotes Ibn al-Qayyim in support of his misguided views, including what Ibn al-Qayyim (may Allah have mercy on him) wrote in his book *Al-Kaba'ir*, where he narrated a story: A Shiite refused to sell flour to a Sunni man until he cursed Abu Bakr and Umar (may Allah be pleased with them). The Sunni man, after repeated persuasion, finally said: "May Allah curse the one who curses them." The Shiite slapped him so hard that his eye bled. The Sunni man, with a companion, then went to the Prophet's chamber in the Prophet's mosque and said: "Peace be upon you, O Messenger of Allah, we have come to you wronged; take our revenge." The next morning, the Sunni's eye was healed.

Iraqi then comments: "Look at the narration of this incident by someone like Ibn al-Qayyim, who mentioned it in a context of pride, and warning against sectarianism. This indicates that seeking help from the Prophet (peace be upon him) is permissible, and it is not considered shirk."

Al-Alusi in his book *Fath al-Mannan* also quotes from Dawood, including what Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned in *Al-Kalim al-Tayyib* and Ibn al-Qayyim in *Al-Wabil al-Sayyib*, about Ibn Umar and Ibn Abbas (may Allah be pleased with them) saying that if a person's leg becomes numb, he should call out: "O Muhammad!" and the numbness will go away. Dawood says: "This is mentioned in the context of teaching Muslims the supplications. If calling out to the absent were shirk, then the Shaykhs and others, as well as the companions of the Prophet (peace be upon him), would be teaching people shirk, may Allah protect us from that."

Then, Uthman bin Mansour follows the example of Dawood bin Jirjis in distorting the words and misplacing them according to whims and misguidance, saying:

Ibn Taymiyyah said after mentioning the types of worship that belong to Allah alone: "But due to the prevalence of ignorance and the lack of knowledge of the effects of the message in many of

the later generations, they could not be declared disbelievers until it becomes clear to them what the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) came with, which contradicts their beliefs.” This is his explicit statement.

Osman said: “They made their mere definition a proof and declared others disbelievers based on it. The proof must be clear to the one being defined, and the truth must be made clear to him in the matter.”

After presenting these quotes selected by these individuals, and their understanding that slaughtering and making vows to other than Allah, and seeking help from the dead, are not part of the things that invalidate Islam, as they also understood from this that they do not declare a specific person a disbeliever, we will follow up with clarification and explanation, removing the confusion and doubt, briefly, based on what some of the Imams of the Da’wah and its supporters have recorded in response to this objection.

The Shaykh (the Imam) presents a text from Ibn Taymiyyah, in which it becomes clear that he asserts that slaughtering for other than Allah is major shirk that takes one out of the Islamic faith. It is also evident that he declares a person who slaughters for other than Allah a disbeliever. He says, may Allah have mercy on him:

“Abu al-‘Abbas, may Allah have mercy on him, said in his book *Iqtida’ al-Sirat al-Mustaqim*, while explaining the verse: {And what has been slaughtered for other than Allah}, its apparent meaning is that whatever is slaughtered for other than Allah, whether one says a formula or not, and the prohibition of this is clearer than the prohibition of what a Christian slaughtered for food, while saying ‘In the name of Allah’ or similar. Just as what we slaughter as an offering to Allah is purer than what we slaughter for food, and we say ‘In the name of Allah,’ because worship of

Allah through prayer and sacrifice for Him is greater than invoking His name at the beginning of a matter. Worship of other than Allah is greater disbelief than seeking help from other than Allah. So, if one slaughters for other than Allah seeking closeness to Him, it is prohibited, even if he says ‘In the name of Allah,’ as some hypocrites in this Ummah do. These are indeed apostates, and their sacrifices are not permissible in any case, for the sacrifice has two prohibitions. This includes what is done in Mecca and other places where people slaughter for the jinn.”

This is the statement of Ibn Taymiyyah.

Some of the enemies of the religion attribute to him that he does not declare a specific person a disbeliever. But look, may Allah guide you, at his declaration that a person who slaughters for other than Allah from this Ummah is a disbeliever, and his clear statement that the hypocrites become apostates by doing this. This refers to the individual person, for it cannot be imagined that the prohibition applies except to the sacrifice of the individual.

Then the Shaykh (the Imam) says: “Ibn Taymiyyah said: ‘I am one of the greatest people in forbidding attributing a specific person to disbelief, sin, or disobedience, except if it is known that the message’s proof has been established upon him, and whoever contradicts it is either a disbeliever or a sinner.’ This is his statement on the matter in every place we have encountered in his words. He does not mention the non-disbelief of the deceased without clarifying that this refers to the situation before the message reaches him. Once the message reaches him, the ruling is made on him based on what the issue requires, either declaring him a disbeliever, a sinner, or someone committing disobedience.

He also clarified, may Allah be pleased with him, that his statement refers to the unclear matters.

He said in response to the mutakallimun (theologians), when he mentioned that some of their

leaders often fell into apostasy: ‘If this is regarding hidden matters, it may be said that they are mistaken or misled, and the proof that would declare them a disbeliever has not been established. But these matters occur in issues that both the general and the special Muslims know that the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) was sent with, and whoever contradicts them is a disbeliever, such as the command to worship Allah alone without associating any partners with Him, and the prohibition of worshipping anyone else. These are among the clearest acts of Islam... Then you find many of their leaders falling into them, and they become apostates. Worse still, some of them composed books in the religion of the polytheists, such as Abu Abdullah al-Razi (i.e., Fakhr al-Razi). His apostasy is clear by the consensus of the Muslims.’ This is his statement.”

Reflect on this, and reflect on what it contains regarding the clarification of the doubt raised by the enemies of Allah. But whoever Allah wills to misguide, you will not have the power to guide him.

The Shaykh (the Imam) then quotes Ibn al-Qayyim, may Allah have mercy on him, confirming that making vows to the dead and calling upon them is major shirk that takes one out of the Islamic faith, and not as the enemies, such as Suleiman bin Abdul Wahhab and others, understood it to be minor shirk. Their objection is based on Ibn al-Qayyim’s mention of minor and major shirk in *Sharh Manazil al-Sa’irin* (The Explanation of the Stages of the Travelers). He mentioned major shirk, then minor shirk, and then said: “Among the types of this shirk is prostrating to the sheikh, and one of its types is repentance to the sheikh, which is a great shirk. Another type is making vows to other than Allah, and seeking the fulfillment of needs from the dead and seeking help from them...”

These opponents attributed to Ibn al-Qayyim that what he mentioned here was minor shirk because Ibn al-Qayyim, after mentioning major shirk, then mentioned minor shirk.

Ibn al-Qayyim then mentioned the types of major and minor shirk, and some ignorant individuals mistakenly thought he was referring to minor shirk. However, as the Shaykh (the Imam) said: “You, may Allah have mercy on you, will find that the words from the beginning to the end in the first and second chapters are explicit and leave no room for misinterpretation.”

To complete the picture of this response, we present Ibn al-Qayyim’s words as summarized by the Shaykh (the Imam):

“Among the types of this shirk is the prostration of the disciple to the sheikh. Another type is repentance to the sheikh, which is a great shirk. Another type is making vows to other than Allah, relying on others than Allah, acting for others than Allah, turning to others than Allah, humbling oneself to others than Allah, seeking sustenance from others than Allah, and seeking the fulfillment of needs from the dead and seeking help from them. This is the essence of the shirk of the world. The dead have already had their deeds cut off, and they can neither benefit nor harm themselves, let alone those who seek help from them. Rather, the dead are in need of those who pray for them, as the Prophet (peace be upon him) advised when we visit the graves of Muslims—to ask Allah for mercy and forgiveness for them. But the polytheists reversed this and visited them in acts of worship, turning their graves into idols to be worshipped. They combined the shirk of the worshipped with changing the religion and opposing the people of tawhid, while attributing the defamation of the dead to them. They defamed the Creator by associating others with Him, and His believing servants by criticizing and opposing them. They defamed those whom they associated with Him, thinking they were pleased with them for this... The only ones

who escape from this major shirk are those who purify their tawhid to Allah, oppose the polytheists for Allah, and seek His wrath as a means to approach Him.”

The Shaykh (the Imam) also quotes another text from Ibn al-Qayyim, proving the takfir (declaring someone a disbeliever) of specific individuals:

“Ibn al-Qayyim said in Ighathat al-Lahfan, regarding the condemnation of glorifying graves:

‘The situation has reached the point where some of their extremists authored a book called Munasik al-Mashahid (Rites of the Shrines). It is clear that this is a departure from the religion of Islam and an entry into the religion of idol worshippers.’ This was mentioned by Ibn al-Qayyim about a man known as Ibn al-Mufid, and I have seen what he said about him. How can one deny the takfir of the specific person?”

Shaykh Abdullah bin Abdulrahman Aba Batin responds to the confusion and distortion by Dawood al-Iraqi, saying:

“Some have reported that Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, may Allah have mercy on him, mentioned statements and anecdotes indicating that calling upon the dead is not shirk, as he narrated that a man came to the grave of the Prophet (peace be upon him) during the famine of the Ramada year and complained to him, and he saw the Prophet ordering him to go to Umar ibn al-Khattab to command him to seek water for the people. There are other similar anecdotes.”

Abu Batin said: “This is a misrepresentation from the narrator and a lie against the Shaykh, may Allah have mercy on him, because he only mentioned this in the context of discussing certain innovations, such as seeking Allah’s help at the grave of the Prophet or others.”

Muhammad bin Nasser al-Tahami reveals how Ibn Jurgis manipulated the texts of Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim, saying:

“The author of the message—i.e., Dawood—mentioned that Shaykh Taqi al-Din and his student Ibn al-Qayyim, may Allah have mercy on them, do not declare disbelief or shirk on those who believe in the graves or seek help from the dead, and that they say this is a type of ‘lesser shirk.’ He presented part of their writings, selectively quoting some of what they said in support of his argument, but he did not complete the research.”

Then al-Tahami quoted from the two Shaykhs’ books, including Ibn al-Qayyim’s mention in *Sharh Manazil al-Sa’irin* about the two types of shirk: major and minor, and after that, Ibn Taymiyyah’s statement in his *Al-Risalah al-Sunnah*:

“Whoever elevates a Prophet or a righteous man and attributes to him a type of divinity, such as saying: ‘O my master so-and-so, help me,’ or ‘Support me,’ or ‘Provide for me,’ or ‘Strengthen me,’ or ‘I am under your protection,’ and similar statements—this is all shirk and misguidance. The person should be given a chance to repent, and if he repents, well and good, but if not, he should be killed. For Allah, the Exalted, only sent the messengers and revealed the scriptures so that He alone would be worshipped, and no other deity should be associated with Him.”

After presenting these quotes, al-Tahami said:

These texts from Ibn Taymiyyah and his student Ibn al-Qayyim, may Allah have mercy on them, clearly declare that whoever believes in the ability of a creature to benefit or harm, makes vows to them, calls upon them, or seeks help from them, is committing major shirk. This is explicit, and the act is of the gravest disbelief, which makes the shedding of blood and confiscation of

wealth lawful. Having understood this, it becomes evident that the arguments presented by the author of the message are refuted, as he invested considerable effort to claim that the actions of these individuals represent minor shirk, falsely asserting that this is the clear position of Ibn al-Qayyim and his teacher, Ibn Taymiyyah. They, however, clearly stated that such actions are major shirk, and the Quranic evidence supports their declarations. If one were to gather all the verses and hadiths on this matter, it would constitute a voluminous book.

Shaykh Abdul Latif bin Abdul Rahman bin Hasan clarifies the confusion that Dawood intentionally caused, suggesting through the context of the texts of the two Shaykhs that they support the excessive veneration of saints and the diversion of certain types of worship—those which should be directed solely to Allah—to the dead. Shaykh Abdul Latif responds to what Dawood quoted from Ibn Taymiyyah’s book *Al-Furqan*:

“The response is that the context and the intent of the Sheikh’s statements, as quoted by the Iraqi, are to deny the concept of wilayah (guardianship) through the actions mentioned, and to reject the idea of using visions, extraordinary occurrences, or seeing those whom one seeks help from, whether they are absent or deceased, as proof of sainthood. He affirmed that if a person were to fly in the air or walk on water, it would not lead people to be deceived by them unless they adhered to following the Messenger and obeying his commands and prohibitions. This is a clear statement from the Sheikh rejecting the use of such occurrences as evidence for sainthood and invalidating them. It does not imply that the deceased or the absent ones come to assist those who seek help from them, nor does it justify using them as proof of sainthood, as claimed by the Iraqi. The Iraqi distorted the meaning of the words and attributed to the Sheikh something his words do not support in any way. Woe to those who do not believe! The Sheikh, may Allah have mercy on him, clearly stated that asking the Prophet (peace be upon him) for help after his death

or in his absence is never permissible. However, many people call upon the dead, the absent, or their sheikhs, and the devils appear to them, fulfilling some of their desires to mislead them from the path of Allah, just as the devils do with idol worshippers and worshippers of the sun and the moon, speaking to them and showing themselves to them. This happens frequently, both in our time and in the past.”

From what Shaykh Abdul Latif said: “Belief in sainthood is not permissible based on seeking help or calling upon others than Allah. The clear words of the Sheikh, the clear teachings of the Quran and the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah all confirm that sainthood is not established through any of the means rejected by the Sheikh, which Dawood ignorantly and unjustly attributed to him. Sainthood is established through belief in Allah, the Last Day, the scriptures, the prophets, and the observance of religious duties. If seeking help from others than Allah were a means of establishing sainthood, it would mean that every object of worship, including the sinful, the fortune tellers, the devils, and even idols, would be considered as possessing sainthood. This is because their worshippers may have their needs fulfilled and may converse with them, as the Sheikh and others have mentioned.”

Shaykh Abdul Latif also responds to what Dawood quoted from Ibn al-Qayyim, when he mentioned an anecdote. Dawood, without understanding or insight, mistakenly interpreted it as permitting seeking help from the Prophet (peace be upon him). Shaykh Abdul Latif’s response was:

“The response is that there is nothing in the anecdote that allows seeking help from the Prophet (peace be upon him). Anyone who does such an act cannot use it as evidence, and this is agreed upon by all Muslims. The phrase was intended to demonstrate Allah’s support for His allies and

the reward for those who support them, not to justify seeking help from others than Allah. Using this story as evidence is a misinterpretation of its purpose and the overall subject of the book in which it was mentioned. Ibn al-Qayyim clearly stated in multiple places that calling upon the dead is the origin of the shirk of the world and that it is major shirk... and this is part of what he said, may Allah have mercy on him.”

As for the response of Shaykh Mahmoud Shukri al-Alusi, a prominent scholar from Iraq, to what Dawood quoted from Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim, and the claim made by Ibn Jurgis that they permit “seeking help from the dead,” which Dawood misleadingly termed “calling upon the absent,” we find that:

The response is that this also is not relevant to our topic. It is not a calling upon someone for something that only Allah can do; at most, it is mentioning the beloved, not asking anything from them or seeking help from them. Otherwise, it would mean that everyone who mentions their beloved is seeking their help, which is clearly false. The phrase in *Al-Shifa* states that Ibn Umar’s leg became numb, and when he was told to mention the one he loved, he cried out, “O Muhammad!” and his leg was healed. This suggests the validity of what people have experienced: when someone is affected by numbness and mentions their beloved, the condition easily disappears, because the happiness of remembering them rejuvenates the natural heat, which dispels the numbness.

I say that this was one of the practices of the Arabs during the time of ignorance. When a person’s leg would become numb, they would mention someone they loved or call upon them, and the numbness would go away. Shaykh al-Alusi even mentions some pre-Islamic Arabic poetry to support this claim. He then says: “Would it be said that these poets, when their legs

became numb, sought help from the one they loved, whether a woman or a boy? I don't believe anyone would say that except someone whose mind is clouded and whose ignorance is compounded."

As for what Ibn Mansour quoted from Ibn Taymiyyah, Shaykh Abdul Latif, may Allah have mercy on him, revealed the distortion of this text by Ibn Mansour and the depth of his ignorance.

He says:

"The response is that you have misquoted the Sheikh's words, omitting the beginning that clarifies his intended meaning. Previously, it was stated that this was a Jewish trick that this critic has inherited a substantial part of... Before this quote, Shaykh al-Islam had clarified in the very letter being referenced that calling upon the righteous alongside Allah and asking for things that only Allah can do, such as forgiveness of sins, guidance for hearts, and provision from an unspecified source, and similar actions from those who worship the dead, call upon the righteous, and seek help from them, is a clear form of disbelief and open polytheism. Its perpetrator is to be called to repentance, and if they do not repent, they are to be killed. After this clarification, he added that due to the prevalence of ignorance, the judgment is not applied to individuals until the guidance and truth brought by the messengers has reached them. Anyone who has received the message of the messengers about the oneness of Allah and the obligation of Islam and understands that the messengers conveyed this, has no excuse for opposing them or abandoning the worship of Allah. This is the basis for declaring someone who worships others than Allah and associates partners with Him as a disbeliever. The Sheikh and the other Muslims do not hesitate in this judgment, and our Sheikh, may Allah have mercy on him, has affirmed this in accordance with the scholars of the Ummah. He did not declare someone a disbeliever until

the proof and evidence had been established, even to the extent that he refrained from declaring a person who worships graves as a disbeliever if no one had yet informed them of the truth.”

Shaykh Abdul Latif then says:

“If the message of the Messenger (peace be upon him) becomes clear to them and they persist in their denial, then they are not responding, and the proof is established against them. Whether their persistence is due to a misconception, like that of the Christians, or out of stubbornness and arrogance, like Pharaoh and his people, both types are to be declared disbelievers when the proof has been established that must be followed. It is not necessary for them to understand the truth as clearly as the Jews did, but it suffices in declaring them disbelievers that they reject the proof and do not accept what the messengers brought.”

In brief, anyone who reads what Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah and Shaykh Ibn al-Qayyim, may Allah have mercy on them, wrote regarding the nullifiers of Islam will find that their views align with what the Imam Sheikh wrote on this issue. As for the claim of disagreement, it can only come from someone whose understanding is limited or whose intentions are misguided, like those adversaries.

Section Five:

The Fallacy of the Claim that Polytheism Has Not Occurred in This Ummah

Presentation and Refutation

Those opposed to the idea of polytheism occurring in this Ummah aimed to deny the occurrence of polytheism among the Muslim community, arguing that this Ummah is protected from such things and that polytheism cannot touch the Muslims because it is a divinely protected and preserved community. We will present their statements on this matter—whether from their books or those quoted by others—and follow them with a refutation and clarification.

First, we find Ibn Aflaq criticizing the Imam Sheikh, saying:

“He denigrates this protected Ummah, which is preserved from error and safeguarded from misguidance, concealing their virtues and accusing them of the gravest form of polytheism, making their worship to Allah a scattered waste.”

Ibn Aflaq also says:

“It has been established with definitive evidence that this Ummah is infallible. To deny their infallibility is closer to disbelief.”

Sulaiman bin Abdul Wahhab presents evidence for the infallibility of this Ummah, saying:

One of the proofs against your claim of declaring someone a disbeliever is what al-Bukhari narrates in his Sahih from Mu’awiya ibn Abi Sufyan, may Allah be pleased with him, who said:

“I heard the Prophet, peace be upon him, say: ‘Whomever Allah wishes good for, He grants him understanding of the religion, and I only divide, and Allah gives. The affair of this Ummah will remain straight until the Hour is established or until the command of Allah comes.’” The evidence from this is that the Prophet, peace be upon him, informed us that the matter of this Ummah will remain upright until the end of time. It is well known that these issues you declare as disbelief, which have been prominent in the past and continue to spread, would have led to the

Ummah being in a state of deviation if they were truly acts of idolatry. If someone were performing these actions, they would be worshipers of idols, and thus the affairs of this Ummah would not be straight but rather turned upside down.

Another proof against your position is found in Sahih al-Bukhari from ‘Uqba ibn ‘Amir, who said that the Prophet, peace be upon him, ascended the minbar and said: “I do not fear for you that you will commit polytheism after me, but I fear for you that you will compete for the world...” The indication here is that the Prophet, peace be upon him, informed us of everything that would happen to his Ummah, and what he informed us about in this authentic hadith was that he did not fear that his Ummah would worship idols, and he assured them of this.

Sulaiman continues with more proofs, stating:

Another proof against your position is what is narrated by Muslim in his Sahih from Jabir ibn Abdullah, who reported that the Prophet, peace be upon him, said: “The devil has given up hope that the worshippers in the Arabian Peninsula will worship him, but he still works to sow discord between them.” Al-Hakim, Abu Ya’la, and al-Bayhaqi also narrated from Ibn Mas’ud that the Prophet, peace be upon him, said: “The devil has despaired of being worshiped by the people of the Arabian Peninsula, but he is content with them committing minor sins, which are the destructive sins.” The evidence here is that the Prophet informed us that the devil had despaired of being worshiped by those who pray in the Arabian Peninsula, and in Ibn Mas’ud’s narration, the devil despaired of being worshiped by idols in the land of the Arabs. This contradicts your doctrine because Basra and the surrounding areas, Iraq beyond the Tigris River where the graves of Ali and Hussain, may Allah be pleased with them, are located, as well as Yemen and the Hejaz—all of these are part of the Arabian Peninsula. Your belief suggests that in these areas, the

devil has been worshiped, idols have been worshiped, and all the people are disbelievers. These hadiths refute your position.

Al-Qabani says:

We say that the Ummah has agreed on declaring those who mislead the Ummah as disbelievers, and this consensus has been transmitted by the Hanbali scholars.

Abd al-Ra'uf ibn Muhammad, after mentioning the hadith on the division of the Ummah, says:

“Division does not lead one out of the Muslim community—the Muhammadan community.

There is no record in the traditions of the Companions and the early generations where anyone prohibited any sect of Islam from entering the Sacred Mosque. Had they declared them disbelievers, they would have prevented them from performing the Hajj.”

Shaykh Abdul Rahman ibn Hassan pointed out some of the opponents who raised this doubt and objected to Shaykh Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab. Shaykh Abdul Rahman, may Allah have mercy on him, said:

“Among those who raised this objection against him were Abdullah al-Muwis, the keeper of the sanctuary, Ibn Isma'il in al-Washm, and Sulaiman ibn Abdul Wahhab in al-Arid. They claimed that no polytheism occurs in this Ummah.”

A man from al-Ahsa during the time of Shaykh Abdul Rahman ibn Hassan said: “O ignorant man, proud of yourself, you have gone astray and are mistaken in your belief regarding this Muhammadan Ummah, which Allah has praised when He said: ‘You are the best nation brought

forth for mankind' (Quran 3:110) and 'Thus We have made you a just nation' (Quran 2:143), meaning a just, excellent nation."

Likewise, Dawood ibn Jirjis claimed that polytheism is impossible in the Muhammadan Ummah, and Osman ibn Mansour echoed this claim, believing that this Ummah has no one who commits disbelief and that it is an entirely righteous Ummah, from the first to the last, with no polytheism present.

When we move to the response and clarification, we observe that the Imam Shaykh has confronted this doubt, removed the confusion, and clarified the truth. He gathered evidence and proofs that confirm the occurrence of polytheism in this Ummah. In his precious book *Kitab al-Tawhid*, he titled a chapter: "What Was Reported Regarding Some of This Ummah Worshipping Idols."

Shaykh Sulaiman ibn Abdullah ibn Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab, in the introduction to the explanation of this chapter, says:

The author intended this chapter as a refutation against the grave worshipers who commit acts of polytheism while claiming that such acts do not occur within the Muhammadan Ummah. They argue that as long as people say *La ilaha illa Allah, Muhammad Rasul Allah*, they cannot fall into polytheism. In this chapter, the author presents evidence from the words of Allah and His Messenger, peace be upon him, demonstrating the different forms of polytheism that have appeared within this Ummah and how many of its members have returned to idol worship. However, a group will always remain steadfast upon the truth, unaffected by those who abandon them, until the command of Allah comes.

This is not the place for extensive detail, nor for listing all the arguments presented by the great scholar in this chapter to refute this misconception. Instead, we will suffice with one piece of evidence mentioned by the Imam in his explanation, as narrated by his grandson, Shaykh Sulayman ibn Abdullah, may Allah have mercy on them. The Imam said:

“The Prophet, peace be upon him, said, as recorded in Sahih al-Burqani: ‘I only fear for my Ummah the misleading leaders. When the sword is drawn upon them, it will not be lifted until the Day of Judgment. The Hour will not be established until a group from my Ummah joins the polytheists and until factions of my Ummah worship idols.’”

Shaykh Sulayman explains:

“In another narration by Abu Dawud, it says: ‘And until tribes from my Ummah worship idols.’ The meaning is clear, and this serves as the proof for the chapter title. It refutes those grave worshipers who deny the occurrence of polytheism and idol worship within this Ummah. A similar meaning is found in the Sahihayn, where Abu Hurayrah narrates that the Prophet, peace be upon him, said: ‘The Hour will not be established until the buttocks of the women of Daws shake around Dhu al-Khalasa’...”

Shaykh Abdul Rahman ibn Hasan, may Allah have mercy on him, refutes the argument of the scholar from al-Ahsa, who had cited two Quranic verses as proof against the possibility of polytheism occurring within this Ummah. Shaykh Abdul Rahman responds:

“He omitted the very part of these verses that serves as evidence against him. Allah described the best nation raised for mankind with three characteristics: commanding what is right, forbidding what is wrong, and believing in Allah. These traits belong exclusively to the people of faith, not

to the disbelievers, polytheists, hypocrites, innovators, and sinners. Allah says: You enjoin what is right, forbid what is wrong, and believe in Allah (Quran 3:110). Therefore, neither polytheists nor hypocrites are among the best of this Ummah; rather, they are its worst.”

Shaykh Abdul Rahman ibn Hasan also states:

“All followers of previous religions—Jews, Christians, Magians, and Sabians—are part of the Ummah to whom the Prophet, peace be upon him, was sent. They are the Ummah of Da’wah (the community that has received the message). However, whoever among them does not believe in the Prophet, peace be upon him, and does not follow him, remains in Hellfire, as Allah says: Indeed, those who disbelieve among the People of the Book and the polytheists will be in the Fire of Hell, abiding therein forever. They are the worst of creatures (Quran 98:6). Allah has declared that they are in the Fire despite being part of this Ummah.”

As for the claim that Allah’s statement “Thus We have made you a just nation” (Quran 2:143) proves the impossibility of disbelief or polytheism in this Ummah, Shaykh Abdul Rahman clarifies:

“This verse addresses the Prophet, peace be upon him, and his companions specifically. It includes all those who follow them in faith. As for the disbelievers, polytheists, and hypocrites, they are the enemies of the just nation in every era and location. No one can claim they belong to the just nation except someone ignorant enough to believe that there are no disbelievers or polytheists within the Ummah.”

Shaykh Abdul Rahman ibn Hasan also highlights various forms of innovation, polytheism, and misguidance that have occurred within this Ummah, including the apostates during the time of

Abu Bakr, the Khawarij in the era of Ali ibn Abi Talib, the Qadariyyah, the Jahmiyyah, the Jabriyyah, the Qarmatians—whom Ibn Taymiyyah described as the worst of disbelievers—the Buyids, the Fatimids, and others.

Regarding Shaykh Sulayman ibn Abdul Wahhab’s argument that the hadith “Satan has despaired of being worshiped by those who pray in the Arabian Peninsula” proves that no polytheism occurs in this region, Shaykh Abdullah ibn Abdul Rahman Abu Butayn responds:

“Ibn Rajab commented on this hadith, explaining that it means Satan has despaired of making all the people return to major disbelief collectively. Ibn Kathir also pointed to this meaning while explaining Allah’s statement: ‘Today, the disbelievers have despaired of your religion’ (Quran 5:3). Ibn Abbas, may Allah be pleased with him, said: ‘It means they have despaired of you returning to their religion.’”

And also, in the hadith, despair is attributed to Satan, clarifying the doer of the action; it does not say “he was made to despair” in the passive voice. Even if it were assumed that he had despaired of being worshiped in the land of Arabia in a continuous manner, this would merely be his assumption and conjecture, not based on knowledge, for he does not know the unseen, and this is an unseen matter known only to Allah. Furthermore, most Arabs apostatized after the death of the Prophet, peace be upon him; many of them returned to disbelief and idol worship, and many believed Musaylima’s false claim to prophethood. Whoever obeys Satan in any form of disbelief has indeed worshiped him. Worshiping Satan is not limited to one type of polytheism, just as the Chosen One, peace be upon him, informed us that this Ummah would follow the ways of previous nations—the Jews, Christians, Persians, and Romans.

Among the responses given by the Iraqi scholar Mahmoud Shukri Al-Alusi regarding the argument based on this hadith, he said:

“...The hadith does not indicate that disbelief will not occur in the Arabian Peninsula or that atheism will be absent from it. To claim such a thing is so baseless that it does not even require refutation. At the death of the Prophet, peace be upon him, some Arab tribes living deep in the Arabian Peninsula apostatized, and Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, fought them after he and the Companions ruled that they had become disbelievers. It is not far-fetched to say that what the Prophet, peace be upon him, meant in his statement ‘Indeed, Satan...’ was that Satan does not hope to be worshiped by the believers in the Arabian Peninsula—those who truly believe in what the Messenger brought from his Lord, submit to it, and adhere to His commands. There is no doubt that those who are in this state of faith are guided by the light of their Lord, and Satan does not hope to be worshiped by them.

The presence of such people in the Arabian Peninsula does not contradict the authentic hadith, as is clear to anyone with a sound heart and rational intellect. The term ‘those who pray’ is often used by scholars to refer to believers.

It is also possible that the term ‘those who pray’ in the hadith refers to a specific group, based on the definite article (Al) denoting a particular known group—those who are perfect in their prayer. This is supported by the Prophet’s statement at the end of the hadith: ‘but he will incite discord among them.’ Al-Tibi said: ‘Perhaps the Prophet, peace be upon him, was informing about the discord that would arise among his companions after his passing.’ That is, Satan has despaired of being worshiped in the Arabian Peninsula, but he still hopes to incite discord.”

Al-Alusi then concluded by saying: “And you know that if a piece of evidence is subject to multiple interpretations, then it loses its strength as proof.”

Just as the Chosen One, peace be upon him, foretold that polytheism would occur and spread in this Ummah—and this prophecy has come true and is clearly witnessed—he also informed us that Allah has guaranteed the preservation of this Ummah’s religion. He, peace be upon him, said:

“A group from my Ummah will continue to be upon the truth, victorious. Those who abandon them or oppose them will not harm them until the command of Allah comes.”

As for Ibn Mansur’s claim that polytheism cannot occur in this Ummah, Shaykh Abdul Latif ibn Abdul Rahman ibn Hasan exposed his deception in this matter, saying:

“In summary, this objector is misleading people by playing with the term ‘Ummah’ and obscuring its meaning. Allah condemns this type of people in His saying: ‘And do not mix the truth with falsehood or conceal the truth while you know [it].’ (Quran 2:42) This is among the greatest forms of deception and confusion. The term ‘Ummah’ can refer to all those to whom the call of Islam has reached, including those who do not respond to it. It can also refer specifically to those who have accepted the message and submitted to what the messengers brought. Whoever does not differentiate between these meanings and apply the texts correctly is among the ignorant and the deceivers.”

Shaykh Abdul Latif further reveals the root of Ibn Mansur’s misconception and explains its cause, saying:

“Know that this objector has not grasped the reality of Islam and Tawheed. He assumes that it is merely a verbal statement, without knowledge or conviction. Otherwise, openly declaring the two testimonies while engaging in clear acts of polytheism is itself a contradiction. Due to his lack of understanding, he denied the classification of the contemporary polytheists as equivalent to the polytheists of old, rejected the principle that analogous cases share the same ruling, and refused to apply legal judgments based on their causes. He assumed that whoever worships the righteous, invokes them, relies upon them, and offers sacrifices to them is still a Muslim simply because he professes La ilaha illa Allah.”

Ibn Mansur’s ignorance is further exposed in his failure to differentiate between the Ummah of Response (Ummah al-Ijabah) and the Ummah of Invitation (Ummah al-Da’wah). Shaykh Abdul Latif refutes this confusion, saying:

*“Not everyone described as belonging to the ‘Ummah’ is necessarily among the followers of Islam and the Qiblah. The Prophet, peace be upon him, said: ‘No one from this Ummah, whether Jew or Christian, hears about me and then does not believe in me, except that he will be among the people of Hellfire.’ (Narrated by Ibn Majah)

And Allah says: ‘So how [will it be] when We bring from every nation a witness, and We bring you, [O Muhammad], against these [people] as a witness? That Day, those who disbelieved and disobeyed the Messenger will wish they were covered by the earth, and they will not conceal [anything] from Allah.’ (Quran 4:41-42)

This verse clearly indicates that these disbelievers are part of the ‘Ummah’ over which the Prophet, peace be upon him, will testify. The term ‘Ummah’ in contexts of praise and divine promise refers specifically to the followers of the Qiblah and those who have responded to the

call of faith. However, in contexts of division and condemnation, it includes others as well. Each context dictates its own interpretation.”*

As for the reluctance to declare certain sects as disbelievers, this is not because they belong to the ‘Ummah,’ but rather—as Shaykh Abdul Latif, may Allah have mercy on him, explains—because:

“Division does not necessarily negate the core of faith and Tawheed that prevents one from leaving the fold of Islam. This is why there has been debate concerning many of these groups. Those who declare some of them as disbelievers do so based on explicit texts from the Quran and Sunnah that declare them so. Meanwhile, those who refrain from declaring them disbelievers argue that the fundamental belief in Islam remains intact and cannot be nullified except by something that clearly contradicts it.”

We conclude this discussion with the words of the great scholar Shaykh Abdul Rahman al-Sa’di, who explains the purpose behind Imam Muhammad ibn Abdul Wahhab’s inclusion of the chapter “What Has Been Mentioned About Some of This Ummah Worshiping Idols” in Kitab al-Tawheed:

Shaykh al-Sa’di, may Allah have mercy on him, states:

*“The purpose of this chapter is to warn against polytheism and to instill fear of it. It establishes that polytheism is indeed a reality within this Ummah, refuting those who claim that as long as one says La ilaha illa Allah and calls themselves Muslim, they remain a Muslim even if they commit acts that nullify Islam—such as seeking aid from graves and calling upon the dead.

The term ‘idol’ (wathan) is comprehensive and includes anything worshiped besides Allah, whether it be trees, stones, structures, prophets, the righteous, or even the wicked. Worship belongs exclusively to Allah. Whoever calls upon or worships anything other than Allah has taken it as an idol and has thus exited the fold of Islam. Merely associating oneself with Islam does not protect one from this reality. Many throughout history have claimed to be Muslim while simultaneously engaging in polytheism, atheism, disbelief, and hypocrisy.

What matters is the essence of faith and its reality, not just empty labels and words devoid of true meaning.”*

Chapter Six: The Misconception of Applying Verses About Polytheists to Muslims

Presentation and Refutation

The opponents fabricate another misconception that, in reality, does not differ from its predecessor. They claim that Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab and his followers deliberately applied Quranic verses—revealed concerning the polytheists and addressed to the disbelievers at that time—to Muslims, thereby equating Muslims with disbelievers.

This is their argument, with the understanding that by “Muslims,” they mean those who seek help from the dead, offer sacrifices to the jinn, and make vows to saints. They consider such individuals to be Muslims—according to their assumption—as long as they acknowledge that Allah alone has power, is the sole doer, and controls benefit and harm. Furthermore, they argue that these individuals remain Muslim because they recite the testimony of faith (Shahada), even if they engage in acts of polytheism.

We will first present their misconception and then follow it with a response and clarification.

Suleiman ibn Abd al-Wahhab refers to this misconception when addressing the supporters of the Salafi Da'wah, saying:

“But this is no more astonishing than your argument based on verses that were revealed about those who, when it is said to them, ‘There is no deity except Allah,’ become arrogant and say, ‘Are we to leave our gods for a mad poet?’” (Quran 37:35-36), and about those to whom it is said, ‘Do you testify that there are other gods with Allah?’ (Quran 6:19), and about those who say, ‘Has he made the gods one God?’” (Quran 38:5). Despite this, you cite these verses and apply them to those who testify that there is no deity except Allah and that Muhammad is His Messenger, who say that there is no partner with Allah, and who affirm that no one deserves worship alongside Allah....”

Alawi al-Haddad also presents this misconception, saying:

“As for the Quranic verses used as evidence to declare Muslims as disbelievers, such as Allah’s saying, ‘Say: To whom belongs the earth and whoever is in it, if you should know?’ They will say, ‘To Allah.’ Say: ‘Then will you not take heed?’” (Quran 23:84-85), and the verses that follow—it is clear that these verses were revealed concerning disbelievers who rejected the Quran and the Messenger. What relevance do these verses have to a Muslim and a disbeliever?”

Likewise, Lakhnawi makes the same claim, saying:

“Just as the Khawarij applied Quranic verses revealed about disbelievers and polytheists to believing Muslims, so too do these Wahhabis apply all such verses about polytheists to the Muslims of the world.”

Dahlan, as usual, adds even more falsehoods and misconceptions, saying:

“They took numerous Quranic verses that were revealed about the polytheists and applied them to the believers.”

He further states:

“They applied Quranic verses revealed about the polytheists to both the elite and common believers. For instance, Allah’s saying, ‘So do not invoke with Allah anyone else’ (Quran 72:18), and His saying, ‘And who is more astray than one who invokes besides Allah those who will not respond to him until the Day of Resurrection and who are unaware of their supplication? And when the people are gathered, they will be enemies to them, and will reject their worship.’ (Quran 46:5-6) They applied these verses to believers and included them in the general meaning of these verses.”

In another passage, Dahlan describes the belief of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab, stating:

“He relied on verses revealed about the polytheists to declare Muslims as disbelievers, applying them to monotheists.”

Al-Zahawi also adopted this misconception and repeated it like others, saying:

“He applied the verses that were revealed concerning the disbelievers of Quraysh to the pious ones of this Ummah.”

Then he repeats it again:

“He took Quranic verses revealed about the polytheists and applied them to all Muslims.”

And he repeats it a third time, saying:

“The Wahhabis applied all Quranic verses revealed about the polytheists to the monotheists of the Ummah of Muhammad, peace be upon him.”

Muhammad Najib Souqiyyah presents this misconception in his usual style of foul language, profound ignorance, and lack of piety, saying about the Wahhabis:

“Is their wickedness not enough in what they claim and deceive the general public with—by saying that all Quranic verses revealed concerning the polytheists and disbelievers are to be applied to all Muslims and monotheists? I wish I knew whether they have ever found anyone who attributes power to anything in existence besides Allah alone, without a partner—or believes that anything other than Allah acts independently in this world.”

This misconception reveals the deception and manipulation of the opponents, as they portray grave worshippers as Muslims and monotheists simply because they acknowledge that Allah is the ultimate doer of all things. Therefore, they argue that such people remain Muslims, as explicitly stated by their so-called “Najib” Souqiyyah.

Sheikh Abdullah Abu Butayn pointed out the danger of this statement from the opponents, saying:

Refutation of the Misconception Regarding the Application of Verses About Polytheists to Muslims

As for the statement of those who claim that the verses revealed concerning the polytheists of old do not apply to those who commit the same actions, this is a grave form of disbelief. Such a claim can only be made by someone deeply entrenched in ignorance. Would this person also say that the legal punishments (hudud) mentioned in the Quran and Sunnah applied only to past

nations that have perished? Should the adulterer not be punished today? Should the thief's hand not be cut off? This is an argument so absurd that one would be embarrassed to mention it. Does this person believe that those addressed with the obligations of prayer, zakat, and other Islamic rulings have perished, rendering the Quranic rulings void?

Sheikh Abdul-Latif ibn Abdul-Rahman ibn Hasan spoke about the consequences of this misconception, saying:

*“Whoever prevents the application of the Quran and its legal rulings to individuals and events that fall under the general meaning of the text is among the most misguided of people and the most ignorant of what Islam and its scholars have upheld generation after generation. Such a person is among those who most severely disable the Quran, abandon it, and isolate it from being used as evidence in disputes. The Quranic texts and their rulings are general, not restricted to specific causes of revelation.

What prevents us from declaring someone a disbeliever if they engage in what the Jews did—turning people away from the path of Allah and disbelieving in Him despite their knowledge?”*

Sheikh Abdul-Latif also pointed out that this misconception was embraced by Dawood ibn Jirjis, stating:

“Among his misconceptions is his statement regarding certain verses: ‘This was revealed concerning those who worship idols; this was revealed about Abu Jahl; this was revealed about so-and-so.’ May Allah curse him! He seeks to render the Quran inapplicable to those who resemble them—those who worship others besides Allah and equate them with their Lord.”

Sheikh Abdul-Latif further explains that this misconception is one of the barriers preventing the correct understanding of the Quran:

*“One of the barriers preventing the understanding of Allah’s Book is the mistaken belief that what Allah has narrated about the polytheists—His rulings upon them and His descriptions of them—applies only to people who lived in the past and have perished, leaving no successors.

Some of them may hear a commentator say, ‘This was revealed concerning idol worshipers; this concerns Christians...,’ and the naïve listener assumes that these verses apply only to them and that the ruling does not extend beyond them. This is one of the greatest obstacles preventing people from understanding the Quran and Sunnah.”*

Sheikh Saleh ibn Muhammad al-Shathri highlights the severity and deviation of this misconception in response to Dahlan, stating:

*“Glory be to Allah! How has following desires led this person to such immense ignorance, blatant contradiction, and distortion of Allah’s clear verses about supplication and seeking aid? He argues that these verses refer only to polytheists and that their ruling does not extend beyond them.

Yet, the rulings of the Quran apply to the entire nation of Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him) until the Day of Judgment. Allah says: ‘That I may warn you thereby, and whomever it reaches.’ (Quran 6:19)

According to this misguided individual’s logic, the rulings of the Quran do not apply beyond those to whom they were first addressed. But Allah addressed the Companions with the religious obligations of prayer, zakat, fasting, and Hajj, as well as with verses on inheritance and legal

punishments. If we were to accept this false argument, it would mean that these rulings do not extend beyond the Companions, which is disbelief and misguidance.

Indeed, the principle is that the wording of the Quran is general, not limited to the specific occasion of its revelation.”*

Al-Sahsawani (may Allah have mercy on him) affirms the correctness of Sheikh Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab’s belief regarding this issue, stating:

*“Yes, the Sheikh (may Allah have mercy on him) used the generality of verses revealed about the disbelievers to declare the grave-worshippers as disbelievers. There is nothing problematic about this, as grave-worshippers are not considered believers by any Muslim.

The Sheikh merely applied the generality of Quranic verses about polytheists to those who call themselves Muslims yet commit acts of disbelief. It is a well-established principle in Islamic jurisprudence that the ruling is based on the general wording of the text, not the specific cause of revelation. This is indisputable.”*

Sheikh Abdul-Karim ibn Fakhr al-Din, responding to Dahlan and others who fell into this misconception, wrote:

*“The ruling is based on the general wording of the text, not the specific reason for its revelation. Applying a verse revealed about a polytheist to a so-called believer who resembles him is widespread and well-known. Because of this, scholars have established the legal principle that resembling disbelief entails disbelief.

The Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) said: ‘Whoever imitates a people is one of them.’”*

Ibn Sahman states:

*“Whoever commits acts of polytheism like those committed by the idolaters—such as diverting the exclusive rights of Allah to others, calling upon prophets, saints, and the righteous alongside Allah, seeking their aid as one would seek it from Allah, or requesting from them what should only be asked from Allah—then what prevents us from applying the Quranic verses to such a person and declaring them a disbeliever?

Scholars have affirmed that the ruling is based on the general wording of the text, not its specific context. But when hearts become blind to the truth and refuse to apply Allah’s rulings concerning polytheists to those who emulate them and follow their ways, then there is no recourse for them.”*

Muhammad Rashid Rida exposes the depth of ignorance among those who promote this misconception, saying:

Refutation of the Claim That Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab Rebelled Against the Ottoman Caliphate

Some opponents of the Salafi movement claim that Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab rebelled against the Ottoman Caliphate, thereby separating from the Muslim community and breaking the obligation of obedience.

Ibn Afaliq describes the monotheism upheld by the followers of the Salafi movement, stating:

“As for your so-called monotheism, which consists of rebelling against Muslims... this is heresy, not monotheism.”

Similarly, Umar Al-Mahjub addressed the followers of the movement, saying:

“You have fallen into division and disunity.”

We also note that Ibn Abidin, in his commentary (as previously mentioned), classified the followers of this movement as Khawarij, placing them under the category of rebels (*baghiy*), those who unlawfully rise against the legitimate ruler.

Dahlan claims that the followers of Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab “separated from the main body of the Muslim community.” Likewise, Al-Zahawi asserts that they became known for “breaking away from obedience to the Commander of the Faithful.” Many critics have labeled the Sheikh and his followers as Khawarij, arguing that one of the defining traits of the Khawarij is rebelling against the ruler of the Muslims and breaking the unity of the ummah simply because of sins that fall short of major disbelief.

This is further elaborated by Al-Amili, who states:

“The Khawarij deemed it lawful to fight the Muslim rulers and rebel against them... and so did the Wahhabis.”

The author of *Khulasat Tarikh Al-Arab* included a section titled:

“Chapter Six: The Wahhabi Rebellion Against Authority.”

Abdul-Qayyum Zaloom claims that the emergence of Wahhabism led to the fall of the Ottoman Caliphate, stating:

“The Wahhabis established an entity within the Islamic state under the leadership of Muhammad bin Saud and later his son, Abdulaziz. England provided them with weapons and financial support, and they launched their expansion on a sectarian basis, seizing Islamic lands under the Caliphate’s authority. In other words, they raised their swords against the Caliph, fought the Islamic army of the Commander of the Faithful, and did so at the instigation and with the aid of the British.”

Before addressing the claim that Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab rebelled against the Ottoman Caliphate, it is appropriate to first highlight his belief regarding the obligation of obedience to Muslim rulers, both righteous and sinful, as long as they do not command disobedience to Allah. This is because obedience is only required in matters that are lawful.

Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab wrote in his letter to the people of Qassim:

Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab’s View on Obedience to Muslim Rulers

Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab stated:

“I believe in the obligation of hearing and obeying the rulers of the Muslims, whether righteous or sinful, as long as they do not command disobedience to Allah. Whoever assumes the caliphate, and the people accept him and pledge allegiance to him, or he overpowers them with his sword until he becomes the caliph, then obedience to him becomes obligatory, and it is forbidden to rebel against him.”

He also said:

“The third fundamental principle is that complete unity includes obedience to whoever is placed in authority over us, even if he is an Abyssinian slave. This was explained in a clear and sufficient manner through various forms of legal and rational arguments. However, this principle is now unknown to many who claim to possess knowledge, let alone being acted upon.”

Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Latif Ibn Abd Al-Rahman Ibn Hassan further affirmed this belief, stating:

“We hold the view that obedience to the rulers of the Muslims is obligatory, whether they are righteous or sinful, as long as they do not command disobedience.”

After establishing Sheikh Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab’s stance on the necessity of obedience to Muslim rulers, as long as they do not command disobedience to Allah, we now address a crucial question regarding the accusation against him:

Was Najd Under Ottoman Control?

Dr. Saleh Al-Aboud answers this question:

*“Najd, in general, never came under the influence of the Ottoman Empire. Its authority never extended to this region, no Ottoman governors were appointed there, and no Turkish garrisons were stationed within its territories before the emergence of Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab’s call. This historical fact is confirmed by an examination of the administrative divisions of the Ottoman state.

A Turkish document titled ‘The Laws of the House of Osman as Contained in the Register of the Diwan,’ written by Yameen Ali Effendi, who was the Keeper of the Imperial Registers in 1018

AH (1609 CE), clarifies that in the early 11th century AH, the Ottoman Empire was divided into thirty-two provinces, including fourteen Arab provinces. Najd was not among them, except for Al-Ahsa, if it is considered part of Najd.”*

Dr. Abdullah Al-Othaimeen also states:

“Regardless of the details, Najd did not experience direct Ottoman rule before the rise of Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab’s call. Moreover, no authority—whether the Jabrids, the Banu Khalid, or the Sharifs—managed to establish strong control over Najd that could dictate its internal affairs. Wars between the Najdi towns persisted, and conflicts among its various tribes remained fierce and intense.”

Dr. Ajeel Al-Nashmi further explains:

“Najd and its surrounding areas were of little concern to the Ottoman Caliphate. Perhaps this policy was due to the vast expanse of these lands and their scattered nature. Another factor was the deeply entrenched tribal and clan-based social structure.”

Ameen Saeed elaborates on this issue:

*“Through our extensive study of the history of the Umayyad and Abbasid dynasties, the Ayyubids, the Mamluks in Egypt, and later the Ottomans who inherited them, we have repeatedly searched for any record of a governor or ruler sent by any of these dynasties to Najd or any of its central, northern, western, or southern provinces. We found nothing. This indicates that these states completely neglected the region.

The conclusion we reached is that they left the affairs of the central and western parts of Najd to the Hashemite Sharifs, the rulers of Hejaz, who exercised only partial supervision over its tribes.”*

He further states:

“Each tribal leader or emir in Najd was completely independent in managing his territory. The Ottomans had no presence there, nor did the people of Najd have any connection with them.”

Hussain Khaz’al describes the state of Najd during the Ottoman era:

“When the year 923 AH arrived and the Ottoman Empire emerged on the political scene of the Arabian Peninsula, the region was never subjected to direct Ottoman central rule. Instead, the Ottomans maintained only nominal authority over it. Each part of the Arabian Peninsula, particularly Najd, remained independent. Tribal rivalries were prevalent, with each clan acting as its own sovereign state, and each local ruler wielding absolute power over his domain.”

Jacqueline Perrin also comments on this matter:

The Ottoman Empire’s Lack of Control Over the Arabian Peninsula

Jacqueline Perrin states:

“The Arabian Peninsula remained inaccessible to the Ottoman conquest due to its vast desert, where the army sent by Sultan Suleiman in 1550 perished from thirst.”

If Najd—the birthplace and starting point of this movement—was never under Ottoman control, how can this accusation hold any weight? How could Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab be accused of rebelling against the Ottoman Caliphate?

Sheikh Ibn Baz's Response to the Accusation

Sheikh Abdul Aziz Ibn Baz addressed this claim, stating:

*“To the best of my knowledge and belief, Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab did not rebel against the Ottoman Caliphate. The Ottomans had no governance or authority in Najd; rather, it was divided into small emirates and scattered villages. Each town or village—no matter how small—had its own independent ruler. These emirates were engaged in conflicts, wars, and disputes among themselves.

Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab did not rise against the Caliphate; instead, he opposed the corrupt practices prevalent in his homeland. He strived and persevered in the path of Allah until the light of this call spread to other lands.”*

Refuting the Claim That the Movement Was a Revolt Against the Ottoman Caliphate

Sheikh Muhammad Naseeb Al-Rifa'i also refuted the notion that Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's movement was a revolutionary attempt to overthrow the Ottoman Caliph and restore the Caliphate to the Arabs. He stated:

*“It never crossed the mind of Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab to overthrow the Caliph of the Muslims, nor did he ever consider such a thing. However, those who surrounded the Caliph at the time—particularly the Sufi mystics—distorted and misrepresented the facts to him. They incited his anger against the Sheikh and his followers, falsely claiming that they were leading a revolutionary movement aimed at restoring the Caliphate to the Arabs.

Yet, Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's core belief—derived from the true Islamic creed—was that it is forbidden to withdraw allegiance from the ruling Caliph unless he commits clear and explicit disbelief (*kufr bawāh*). The Sheikh never saw anything of the sort in the Ottoman Caliph to justify calling for his removal.

Even if the Caliph was personally sinful, unless his transgressions reached the level of open disbelief, rebellion against him was not permissible. The movement had nothing to do with the Caliphate at any stage. Even after gaining control over Najd and Hejaz, they never revolted against the Caliph. The Caliphate was never a factor in their cause.”*

From these statements, it is evident that Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab harbored no hostility or enmity toward the Ottoman Caliphate.

Sheikh Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's Position Toward the Ottoman Caliphate

Dr. Ajeel Al-Nashmi states:

*“We can confidently say that Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's writings contain no explicit statements expressing hostility toward the Ottoman Caliphate.

Furthermore, we have found no fatwa from him declaring the Ottoman state as disbelievers. His fatwas were strictly limited to the nearby Bedouins whom he knew were engaged in acts of polytheism.”*

In fact, as Al-Nashmi explains, Sheikh Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's position toward the Caliphate was that of an advisor enjoining good and forbidding evil. He never sought armed confrontation, as is

evident from his approach toward the Sharifs who ruled Hejaz in the name of the Ottoman Caliphate.

Al-Nashmi also highlights historical events during the Sheikh's lifetime that prove his noble stance and respect for the Ottomans.

Sheikh Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's Stance on the Hejaz

Al-Nashmi summarizes the Sheikh's policy toward Hejaz:

*“Throughout his life, Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab was never known to incite, provoke, or call for war against Hejaz or to seize control over it. He recognized that such an act could be interpreted as rebellion against the Ottoman Caliphate.

The Ottoman Caliphate itself never took any action against him, nor did it express any opposition to his movement. This remained the case during the reigns of four successive Ottoman Sultans during the Sheikh's lifetime.”*

How Did the Ottoman Caliphate View Sheikh Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's Movement?

Dr. Ajeel Al-Nashmi answers this question:

“The Ottoman Caliphate's perception of Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's movement was highly distorted and misrepresented. The Caliphate only received an adversarial portrayal of the movement, whether through reports from its governors in Hejaz, Baghdad, and other regions or from individuals who traveled to Istanbul carrying misleading accounts.”

Distortion and Fabrication in Reports About Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab

Dr. Ajeel Al-Nashmi cited several examples showing the extent of distortion and misrepresentation contained in these reports or spread by individuals. The effects of this misinformation, along with the falsification and alteration of facts, remain evident in many writings about Ottoman history.

One example of this distortion can be seen in the writings of the Turkish historian Suleiman bin Khalil Al-Azi, who stated:

“The correspondence received in Constantinople from Sharif Mas’oud bin Sa’id, the Sharif of Mecca, indicated that an atheist, irreligious man named Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab had emerged from the east, forcibly subjugating the people of that region through a false interpretation of Islam.”

Refuting the Claim That Sheikh Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab’s Call Led to the Fall of the Ottoman Caliphate

As for the claim made by Zalloum that Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab’s movement was among the causes of the Ottoman Caliphate’s downfall and that the British aided the Wahhabis in overthrowing it, Mahmoud Mahdi Al-Istanbuli refuted this assertion, stating:

“The writer should have supported his claim with evidence and proof. As the poet once said:

If claims are made without proof,

Then their very emptiness proves them untrue.”

Furthermore, historical records show that the British opposed the Wahhabi movement from its inception, fearing it would awaken the Islamic world.

Al-Istanbuli continues:

“It is both laughable and lamentable that this writer accuses Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab’s movement of contributing to the collapse of the Ottoman Caliphate. This movement began around 1811, while the Caliphate was abolished in 1922!”

British Opposition to the Wahhabi Movement

Evidence that the British opposed the Wahhabi movement includes their actions during Ibrahim Pasha’s campaign against Diriyah. The British sent Captain Forster Sadlier to congratulate Ibrahim Pasha on his victory over the Wahhabis during his military campaign against Diriyah. In addition, Sadlier reaffirmed Britain’s willingness to cooperate with him in curbing what they called ‘Wahhabi piracy’ in the Arabian Gulf.

This letter explicitly stated Britain’s desire to establish an agreement with Ibrahim Pasha to completely eradicate Wahhabi influence.

British Use of the “Wahhabi” Label as a Weapon

Sheikh Muhammad bin Manzoor Al-Numani sheds light on how the British exploited this term:

*“The British took advantage of the hostility against Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab, labeling anyone who opposed them or stood in their way as ‘Wahhabis.’

They even branded the scholars of Deoband in India as Wahhabis because of their outspoken opposition to British rule and the restrictions they placed on British influence.”*

Exposing the Falsehood of This Accusation

These diverse sources expose the falsehood and weakness of this claim, as they are refuted by:

- The clear and explicit evidence from Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab's own writings and teachings.
- The historical facts recorded by impartial scholars.

A Call for Further Research on Specific Allegations

Abu Al-Barakat added his perspective:

*“I believe that the general refutations regarding accusations such as takfir, rebellion against the Caliphate, and warfare have been thoroughly refuted and clarified for any fair-minded and rational person.

However, it is essential for researchers, scholars, and students of knowledge to investigate certain accusations directed at Sheikh Muhammad Ibn Abd Al-Wahhab.

Additionally, they must clarify the true meaning of some of his statements, which his opponents either misunderstood or failed to grasp due to their ignorance of the real beliefs and practices of those whom he opposed—such as those who engaged in polytheism and seeking aid from beings other than Allah.

This is my view, and I believe that focusing on these matters would be more beneficial than discussing general issues that have already been extensively debated and explained.”*

Fin.

May Allah have mercy on my friends and myself and heal us and protect us and have mercy on all of our deceased. Ameen.